The Proceedings of the 12th Annual Northern Plains Conference on Earlier British Literature

April 16, 17, 2004
Augustana College
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Edited by
Timothy S. Jones

Carl B. Ylvisaker Library
Concordia College
Moorhead, MN 56562

PR 7 .N67 2004
Northern Plains Conference
on Earlier British
Proceedings of the twelfth
annual Northern Plains

Proceedings of the 12th Annual Northern Plains Conference on Earlier British Literature
Copyright © 2005 by Timothy S. Jones. After publication all rights revert to the authors.
Printed at Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD

Contents

Program of the 2004 Northern Plains Conference on Earlier British Literature

Trial by Combat: Law, Chivalry, Theology, and Spectacle 1
Eric Jager

The Comic Refuser, Part 3:
The Taming of the Shrew, *Love's Labors Lost*, and *The Tempest* 4
Douglas Northrup

Reconstructing Richard:
How Productions from 1700 to 1850 Transformed Shakespeare's *Richard III* 12
Roger Ochse

The Tempest:
Discovering Comic Possibilities in the Shakespearean Text Through Performance 22
Jennifer Jacobson

Adapting the Master: Joe Calarco and *Shakespeare's R + J* 26
Lysbeth Em Benkert

"And never shall my harp thy praise forget":
Anaphora, Anamnesis, and the Reader in Book 3 of *Paradise Lost* 32
Nicholas Wallerstein

Marvell's Poetry and *The Serpent's Kiss* 42
Bruce Brandt

Stealing Marvell's Poetry: Self-Actualization in *The Serpent's Kiss* 49
Karen Zagrodnik

"I thought perhaps the reapers was going to do something to you":
The Serpent's Kiss and the Issue of Reverse-Objectification 57
Jason McEntee

Translating the *Odyssey*: A Comparative Computer Text Analysis 64
Staci Hull

Northern Plains Conference on Earlier British Literature 2004
Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD

Friday, April 16 (Center for Western Studies)

12:00-12:30 Registration and Coffee

12:30-1:50 Speaking and Tongues (Chair: Robert De Smith, Dordt College)

Michael Kensak (Northwestern College), "'My first metere I wil yow telle': Losing (And Finding) Your Place in Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*"

Nicholas Wallerstein (Black Hills State University), "'And Never Shall My Harp Thy Praise Forget': *Anaphora*, *Anamnesis*, and the Reader in Book 3 of *Paradise Lost*"

Gretchen Minton (University of Minnesota at Morris), "A 'most miraculous organ': The Tongue in English Renaissance Drama"

2:00-2:50 Undergraduate Research

Jennifer Jacobsen (Black Hills State University), "*The Tempest*: Discovering Comic Possibilities in the Shakespearean Text Through Performance"

Staci Hull (Dakota State University), "Translating the *Odyssey*: A Computer Text Analysis"

3:00-4:20 Phillipe Rousselot's *The Serpent's Kiss* (Chair: Jeffrey Miller, Augustana College)

Jason McEntee (South Dakota State University)

Bruce Brandt (South Dakota State University)

Karen Zagrodnik (South Dakota State University)

4:30-5:00 Coffee and Refreshments (Madsen Center Rotunda)

5:00 Welcome: Richard Hanson, Academic Dean

5:15-6:15 Eric Jager (University of California, Los Angeles)

"Trial by Combat: Law, Chivalry, Theology, and Spectacle" (Madsen Center 202)

This lecture is funded in part by Augustana College's Mellon Fund Committee.

7:00 Dinner: Kristina's Cafe 334 (334 S. Phillips Ave.)

Saturday, April 17 (Madsen 101)

9:00-10:20 Chaucer (Chair: Timothy Jones)

David Sprunger (Concordia College), "The Counting Board in Chaucer's Shipman's Tale"

Karla Knutson (University of Kansas), "The Sincerity of Lovesickness in The Knight's Tale and The Miller's Tale"

Kristin Bovaird-Abbo (University of Kansas), "Mind of Matter: Marriage and Mastery in the Franklin's Tale"

10:30-11:50 Shakespeare in Performance (Chair: Sandra Looney, Augustana College)

Roger Ochse (Black Hills State University), "Reconstructing Richard: How Productions from 1700 to 1850 Transformed Shakespeare's Richard III"

Douglas Northrop (Ripon College), "The Comic Refuser III"

Lysbeth Benkert-Rasmussen (Northern State University), "Adapting the Master: Joe Calarco and *Shakespeare's R &J*"

12:00-1:00 Lunch (3-in-1 Room, Morrison Commons)

1:30-2:50 Literature and the Religious Imagination (Chair: Janet Schrunk Ericksen, University of Minnesota, Morris)

Brian O'Camb (University of Wisconsin), "To Hel(l) and Back: The Breca Episode and Beowulf's Cleansing of the Haunted Mere"

Janet A. S. Ericksen, "Junius: Manuscript or Book"

Robert De Smith (Dordt College), "A Storm of Biblical Proportions: Echoes of Shipwrecks and Storms in *The Tempest*"

3:00-4:20 Romance (Chair: David Sprunger, Concordia College)

Muriel Brown (North Dakota State University), "*Havelok the Dane*: The Growth and Development of an Ideal King"

Gregory M. Sadlek (University of Nebraska, Omaha), "Sir Bors: The Importance of Malory's Flawed Survivor"

Andrea Gronstal Benton (University of Wisconsin), "'In wretched weedes disguiz'd': Timias and the Medieval Wild Man Topos in Book IV of the *Faerie Qveene*"

Trial by Combat: Law, Chivalry, Theology, and Spectacle

Eric Jager
University of California, Los Angeles

[Editor's Note: The following are the introductory remarks Eric Jager offered as a prelude to reading the eighth chapter of his book at the conference. Due to copyright considerations we are unable to include Professor Jager's complete paper. However, the chapter and the rest of the story of the Carrouges-LeGris feud and combat can now be read in *The Last Duel* (Broadway, 2004).]

This talk is drawn from my forthcoming book, *The Last Duel: A True Story of Crime, Scandal, and Trial by Combat in Medieval France.* The book tells the story of a Norman knight, Jean de Carrouges, who in the year 1386 accused his old friend and fellow courtier, a squire named Jacques LeGris, of having raped Jean's young and beautiful wife, Marguerite.

The alleged crime took place in Normandy, where the case had its first official hearing. The knight and the accused squire, both vassals to Count Pierre of Alençon, had recently fallen out over land and patronage. The rape charges turned them into mortal enemies. LeGris was Count Pierre's favorite, and Carrouges one of his lord's most contentious vassals. When the count declared LeGris innocent of the crime, the outraged knight appealed his case to the king of France.

The appeal led to a formal challenge before the Parlement of Paris. In July 1386, the two men, flanked by their lawyers, pledges, and relatives, appeared before the Parlement in the old Palais de Justice along the riverbank in Paris. King Charles VI, only 17 years old, presided. As the court watched, Carrouges accused LeGris of the notorious crime against his wife, threw down his gage of battle–traditionally a gauntlet or a glove–and challenged him to a judicial duel. LeGris picked up the gage, declared his innocence, and swore to defend his claim in mortal combat.

The Parlement opened a formal inquiry to decide whether a duel was warranted. The high court gathered evidence and deposed witnesses, including Marguerite herself, who by now was obviously pregnant. As the inquiry lasted into August and September, there were various arrests and even interrogations under torture. At one point, some mysterious letters about the accused squire and the lady arrived by courier from Normandy. As rumors swirled, and the royal court divided over the

quarrel, news of the *cause célèbre* traveled beyond France.

A classic case of "he said, she said," the quarrel confounded the Parlement, whose magistrates finally threw up their hands and ordered a judicial duel. By this time, duels were very rare in France, and the prospect of a fight to the death between two noblemen threw the court and the city into a frenzy of excitement. An added attraction was that Marguerite's fate hung on the outcome. If her husband lost the duel, she would be proven guilty of perjury and pay with her life.

The dramatic story of the knight, the squire, and the lady unfolds during the devastating Hundred Years War between France and England, as enemy troops pillage the land, madness lurks in the French court, the Great Schism splits the Church, Muslim armies threaten Christendom, and rebellion, treachery, and plague turn the lives of all into toys of Fortune.

I first got the idea for this book ten years ago after finding an account of the Carrouges-LeGris affair in Froissart's *Chronicles*. The project has consumed the past five years of research and writing, including trips abroad to visit manuscript archives and historical sites. Besides several chronicles, the original sources include the records of the Parlement of Paris, some notes on the case kept by the squire's lawyer (which amazingly survive), and various family documents. In Paris, I even saw receipts for the travel expenses of the courier who rushed those mysterious letters to Paris–although the letters themselves have vanished.

The book also required extensive research on topics such as arms and armor, castles and fortification, medieval roads, the history of Normandy, the lives of Charles VI and the French royal family, the Hundred Years' War, the laws concerning rape in medieval France, the rituals and procedures of the judicial duel, the geography and social history of late-fourteenth-century Paris, etc.

My research is fully documented in the notes to my book. But the book is written as a popular narrative, telling the remarkable story of the Carrouges-LeGris quarrel as it unfolded, and filling in the historical background as needed.

* * *

The duel was fought on December 29, 1386, at Saint-Martin-des-Champs (St. Martin's), a monastery on the northern edge of Paris whose grounds had a special field for combat and enough space to hold thousands of spectators.

Saint-Martin's was one of two monasteries at Paris that maintained a field of combat, and many judicial duels had been fought there over the centuries.

The place of battle was a piece of smooth, flat ground about eighty yards long by twenty wide, covered with a layer of clean sand to soak up blood. It was surrounded by a high wooden wall made of sturdy timber lattice-work through which spectators could watch the duel's progress.

Lining one side of the field were raised viewing stands for high-ranking spectators, including the king and his court. The other spectators would sit or stand on the ground. Heavy gates barred access to the field at either end, and fronting each gate was a small military camp.

Each camp had a tent or pavilion, along with a heavy throne-like chair on a raised platform, and a mounting bench.

* * *

For an excerpt from the book that describes the beginning of the duel, see the following website:

<www.thelastduel.com>

The Comic Refuser, Part 3: *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Love's Labor's Lost*, and *The Tempest*

Douglas A. Northrop
Ripon College

The three plays under consideration here are together because they seem to me to push the limits of the comic refuser role. One is in a sense outside the play; one is arguably outside humanity; and the third (not in the order given above) reverses the usual expectations, that is, he marries at the end of the play and the other characters do not. Each comic refuser of this group, therefore, will require some special consideration and some special argument.

I have argued that the comic resolution usually involves a series of marriages, a feast, or another form of celebration bringing the society together in a new harmony. Thus we have the dance at the end of *Much Ado*, the pairing off into marriages at the end of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, or *Twelfth Night*, and the family reunion and feast at the end of *Comedy of Errors*. Similarly, there is a wedding banquet at the end of *The Taming of the Shrew*, but we must note a variation immediately: there has been an earlier wedding banquet for the marriage of Petruchio and Katherina. This later and final banquet is for the wedding of Bianca and Lucentio and perhaps for Hortensio and the widow, but certainly it is also a celebration of Petruchio and Katherina's newly established harmony and of the undisguising of all the many characters who have been supposed to be someone else. Hortensio is no longer pretending to be Litio, Lucentio no longer pretends to be Cambio, Tranio no longer pretends to be Lucentio, and the Pedant no longer pretends to be Vincentio. Indeed, all the characters are revealed in their true identities, including the fathers Baptista and Vincentio who are gracious and supportive of the young lovers. But also Bianca and the Widow are disclosed as less compliant than their spouses hoped. Climactically, Katherina and Petruchio are discovered to be the most harmonious couple, each fulfilling the traditional role in marriage at their time. Petruchio is exposed to be not the madcap he has pretended to be, but an affectionate and devoted husband who has worked to establish harmony in the household, and Katherina is revealed to be a loving and obedient wife who accepts her position with equanimity. But more on the nature of this harmony later.

In *The Taming of a Shrew*, the play published in 1594 and now widely thought to be a memorial version of the same play published in the Folio in 1623, Christopher Sly is also revealed at the end for who he is.[1] His assumed role of lord is stripped from him, and he ends up out on the street in his former garb and condition of tinker. This earlier printed version, called *A Shrew*, explicitly keeps Sly and his lady on stage commenting on the play which is being performed before them, has Sly fall asleep, and has the Lord order him redressed as a tinker and thrown out on the street. There may be as many arguments as there are scholars on how to relate or combine these two versions of the story.[2] Some believe that the continuing presence and final expulsion of Sly represents at least Shakespeare's original version, and that the cutting of those later incidents involving Sly was occasioned by the need for a small cast. Removing Sly, the lord, and other attendants from the stage allows for doubling of parts later in the play.

Certainly the folio version, called *The Shrew*, leaves some unresolved problems about Sly's presence and final disposition. After his sleepy comments at the end of the second scene in the folio version, Sly has no further lines nor is any mention made of him. Does he watch the rest of the play? Does he sleep or wake? If he is left sleeping when the play concludes, what becomes of Sly? Each production must make some resolution of the problem. Many merely omit the frame and Sly's role. Some recent productions have accepted the scholarly arguments for the validity of *A Shrew* as an authentic Shakespearean play, however badly remembered or modified. These incorporate some of the business with Sly into the production, including the final incident where Sly is returned to the stage and awakes as a tinker to head for home full of the belief that he will be able to tame his wife based on what he has learned from watching the play or from his dream as he now calls it. In *A Shrew* the Tapster awakens Sly who claims:

> I know how to tame a shrew,
> I dreamt upon it all this night till now,
> And thou hast wakt me out of the best dreame
> That ever I had in my life, But Ile to my
> Wife presently and tame her too

---

[1]See, for instance, Ann Thompson's edition of *The Taming of the Shrew* in the New Cambridge Shakespeare, where she says: "The relationship between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* has been vigorously debated; it was once thought that *A Shrew* was the source for *The Shrew*, but it is now generally agreed that *A Shrew* is some kind of memorial reconstruction of *The Shrew* itself. . . ." (New York: Cambridge UP, 1984).

[2]Jay L. Halio argues in "The Induction as Clue in *The Taming of the Shrew*" that Sly is deceived into a pretended real identity while Katherine is persuaded into her real identity. While I concur with Halio on the importance of the induction, I believe the contrast is between Sly, who does not shed his disguise, and all those characters who do (*"A Certain Text": Close Readings and Textual Studies on Shakespeare and Others in Honor of Thomas Clayton*, eds. Linda Anderson and Janis Lull [Newark: U of Delaware P, 2002], 94-106).

And if she anger me. (scene xix)[3]

I believe the comparison of the two wedding feasts will clarify the role of Sly and show us what resolution the comic refuser refuses. The first feast occurs off stage, as they often do, and all are invited, but Petruchio and Katherina do not attend; that is, the bride and groom miss their wedding banquet. Baptista still urges all to attend and provides substitutes for the missing couple:

> Neighbours and friends, though bride and bridegroom wants
> For to supply the places at the table,
> You know there wants no junkets at the feast.
> Lucentio, you shall supply the bridegroom's place,
> And let Bianca take her sister's room. (3.2.244-48)[4]

In the earlier play, *A Shrew*, Alfonso, the father of the bride, says merely:

> but we forget
> Our marriage dinner now the bride is gone,
> Come let us see what there they left behind. (viii)

Whatever the relationship between the two plays, clearly the first banquet serves a different function in each play. In addition to the substitution of the wedding couple in *The Shrew*, there is also the substitution of Tranio for Lucentio; the substitute groom is in fact a substitute at another level. Petruchio and Katherina's absences from the feast create, but also reinforce, a false celebration. Even had they attended, others would have been playing false roles, and they, the wedding couple, would not have achieved their roles as happily married husband and wife.

It is remarkable that the final scene of *The Shrew*, the wedding feast, gathers all the characters who have played roles in the action and who have recovered themselves. Even the Pedant is included according to the folio stage direction. That is, all those who have tried to be someone else have now returned to their proper character and to behaving in accordance with that role. This resolution includes the widow and Bianca who have left their assumed characters taken up during courtship and have revealed themselves for the willful persons they are. It also includes Petruchio and Katherina who have reconciled their differences and become a harmonious couple, each understanding and enjoying the role they have accepted in marriage. There remains only one character, then, in *The Shrew* who still exists in his

[3]Quotations from *A Shrew* are from Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Volume I, Early Comedies, Poems, Romeo and Juliet* (London: Routledge, 1957).

[4]Quotations from *The Shrew* are from The Arden Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. Brian Morris (New York: Routledge, 1981).

assumed role, who has not become truly himself, and that is Christopher Sly. For the play to fulfill its structure and for the comic refuser to fully define the quality of the comic resolution by rejecting it, Christopher Sly must stay in his assumed character of the lord. He can sleep away the time or be awake and watchful, but he must not return to his proper role as tinker. Adapting the conclusion of *A Shrew* to the ending of *The Shrew* distorts the unity of the play, changes the direction of the action, and undermines the role of the comic refuser.

The unusual ending of *Love's Labor's Lost* is signaled by Berowne who notes:

> Our wooing doth not end like an old play:
> Jack hath not Jill. These ladies' courtesy
> Might well have made our sport a comedy. (5.2.862-64)[5]

The four lords have wooed their ladies, but, according to the Princess, speaking for all the women,

> We have received your letters full of love,
> Your favors, the ambassadors of love,
> And in our maiden council rated them
> At courtship, pleasant jest and courtesy,
> As bombast and as lining to the time.
> But more devout than this in our respects
> Have we not been and therefore met your loves
> In their own fashion, like a merriment. (5.2.771-78)

Now, with the news of her father's death, the Princess wisely concludes there is no time to make a serious decision. Navarre urges her to declare her love "at the latest minute of the hour," but she responds: "A time, methinks, too short / To make a world-without-end bargain in" (5.2.781, 783-84). The women will spend the year in mourning for the Princess's father, and they urge the men to spend the year in serious consideration, not unlike their original plan of sequestration and study. Then, if their loves are still holding, they should seek the women's favor again and the answer will be *yes*.

Thus, the usual pattern for the conclusion of a comedy is stood on its head; the unions do not occur; no feast or dance brings the society together. However the final line is interpreted, "You that way, we this way," there is no gathering of the society but a dispersal in different directions.

The exception to this failure to achieve union is Armado who announces his arrangement with Jaquenetta: "I am a votary; I have vowed to Jaquenetta to hold the

[5]Quotations from *Love's Labor's Lost* are from The Arden Shakespeare, *Love's Labor's Lost*, ed. H. R. Woudhuysen (Walton-on-Thames: Nelson, 1998).

plough for her sweet love three year" (5.2.870-72). Armado, the braggart, one of the most extravagant speakers in the play, has not been assigned a year of thoughtful reflection before union with his desired companion; he has rushed into union, first by impregnating Jaquenetta and now by vowing to spend three years with her in farming. Armado, by his choice of a different resolution, seems to fulfill the role of the comic refuser, but what is it he is refusing? It is certainly not the union into a larger society of wedding and feasting that regularly characterizes comic conclusions and the refuser's response to them. In this case the four lords seem to be the comic refusers (or since it the women who refuse them, they may be the refusees), and Armado stands alone as the only Jack who mates with his Jill.

This unusual comedy disrupts our expectations just as the ladiesí responses disrupt the expectations of the lords. The lords expect to be accepted into the society of the women by showing off their wit and style, but they are rejected and the society does not form in a place, either in the court or in the park outside it. The emergent society is unified by attitude, not by presence. The lords and ladies all soberly accept their responsibilities and go off to fulfill their various duties. They have had to recognize the harshness of life, the reality of death, and the importance of sympathy. Life will not conform to their joyful notions of either scholarly retreat or courtly engagement. Wit will not resolve the problems they now face; it cannot gloss over the real pain of loss or the real need for understanding and compatibility in marriage.

Shakespeare has some claim to being known as an innovator, indeed as a playful innovator. Who else has a sonnet sequence built around a same sex relationship? Who else takes a comedy and turns it into the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*? Whether he is doubling the confusions in *Comedy of Errors* or humanizing a stereotype in Shylock, Shakespeare consistently refused to use the standard formula. While there are some similarities among the comic refusers, the role is amazingly diverse. Shakespeare explores the boundaries of the role, as he does of the genres.

Certainly *Love's Labor's Lost* is an exploration of the limits of comedy. One could argue that Boyet and the Princess's father (the king of France) are the older generation putting obstacles in the way of young love. But Boyet's insights into the lords' efforts at romancing and the King's death are less serious obstacles to the path of true love than are the lords' own exuberant efforts to impress by eloquence or extravagance. Their flights of entertainment are just as frivolous as their plans to establish an academy. The goal of study or romancing is not bad in itself; it is the exaggerated means by which they choose to pursue these goals that makes their efforts not only comical but also mockable. Indeed, to the degree that the tasks imposed by the Princess and the other ladies of the French court parallel the general intentions of the proposed academy, they may be said to support Navarre and his companions in their original goal. The duration and the conditions are somewhat more modest, however. The men should spend one year not three and in regulated life not extraordinary deprivation of food and sleep. Berowne's task has a special quality to curb his particular form of exuberance: he must learn to control his wit and limit his "idle scorns" (5.2.853). The conclusion of *Love's Labor's Lost*, then, far from a feast or celebration opens into a period of mourning for the French court and of "frosts and fasts, hard lodging and thin weeds" for the court of Navarre (5.2.795). The pleasure here is twofold. First there is the pleasure of expectation. One expects or at least hopes that the men are sincere and constant in their declared loves and will fulfill the year long tasks proposed them without the vow breaking that has characterized their behavior until now. Second, there is the pleasure of seeing their reformation. Throughout the play they have moved, slowly and fitfully, from their unthinking commitments to a more controlled and doable stance. They have recognized their obligations in the court, their limitations as irresistible wooers, and their need for sober thought and action. Both of these pleasures lead us in the direction of comedy, toward a new, better, freer society without the unnatural constraints and conventions that inhibit human relatedness. The final formation of that society is postponed, but the direction is indicated. It is this comic direction that Armado refuses; he will grasp his mate without the reformation of character required for love to blossom.

Much of the argument about the conclusion of *The Tempest* concerns the final dispositions of Antonio and Sebastian. Critics note that there is no sign of their repentance and thus no way for Prospero's forgiveness to include them in the resolution of the play and in the emergence of the new and reformed society. Whether repentance is necessary for forgiveness is an interesting theological as well as ethical question, and may be an important issue for the play. But Prospero settles that issue with dispatch and clarity when he says to Antonio:

> For you, most wicked sir, whom to call brother
> Would even infect my mouth, I do forgive
> Thy rankest fault, -- all of them; and require
> My dukedom of thee, which perforce, I know,
> Thou must restore. (5.1.130-34)[6]

There has been no sign of Antonio's repentance, and yet Prospero is straightforward in his declaration of forgiveness. The point that is perfectly clear on stage is that, however reluctantly, Antonio and Sebastian are part of the group that adjourns to Prospero's cell and will be part of the group that sails to Milan to celebrate the wedding, the restoration of Prospero to his rightful position, and thus the establishment of the new society. Even Trinculo and Stephano will make the voyage home and, even if marginally, will be part of the new society.

Who is not part of that group? Only Ariel and Caliban. They are restored to their original status: Ariel to the freedom of the air and Caliban to possession of the island.

[6]Quotations from *The Tempest* are from The Arden Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. Frank Kermode (New York: Routledge, 1992).

My argument is, therefore, that they are the comic refusers and by their non-participation in the new society, whether or not it is a Brave New World, they help to define the nature and direction of the comedy. What they refuse is to participate in humanity, to be human with all the faults and possibilities that go with it. The play seems to me to be enriched by this perspective. Ariel flies above humanity; Caliban creeps below it. Prospero must drop his cloak, bury his staff, and give up his magic to rejoin it. He must accept his own human limitations and responsibilities to rejoin this society. The range included is as broad as humanity if limited to it: from the drunken butler and jester, to the unrepentant usurpers, the outspoken but competent sailors, through the well-intentioned if garrulous old lord, the young lovers, the King of Naples, and the re-established Duke of Milan. But participation in humanity has been the problem from the beginning, indeed even before the beginning of the play. Prospero explains to Miranda how he was displaced as Duke:

> those [the Liberal Arts] being all my study,
> The government I cast upon my brother
> And to my state grew stranger, being transported
> And rapt in secret studies. (1.2.74-77)

His being transported to the island physically fulfills the mental condition already existing.

We might reasonably ask whether he is still "transported and rapt." Does something need to change before he can leave his almost self-willed exclusion from humanity? A directorial problem emerges at just this point in the play. Three times in his telling the story of their expulsion from Milan, Prospero questions whether he has Miranda's attention. I have seen productions where she plays with flowers or otherwise indicates that her mind is drifting off. I find, however, nothing in the text or her character to justify this interpretation. It makes more sense, at least to me, to have Prospero become so enrapt in his telling that he drifts away from Miranda, making the accusations a deflection of his own lack of attention to her. I would suggest that Prospero is demonstrating the same self-centeredness in his presentation to Miranda that he did in his dukedom, and it is he who is not attending.

Critics often claim that the play is about forgiveness, Certainly that is a significant theme, explicitly invoked in Prospero's response to Ariel's confession of sympathy:

> Though with their high wrongs I am struck to thí quick,
> Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury
> Do I take part: the rarer action is
> In virtue than in vengeance. (5.1.25-28)

Prospero does forgive them all, whether they have proved to be penitent or not. He even will forgive Caliban who does show serious signs of regret and promise for

reformation:
Prospero says:

> Go, sirrah, to my cell;
> Take with you your companions; as you look
> To have my pardon, trim it handsomely.

Caliban responds:

> Ay, that I will; and I'll be wise hereafter,
> And seek for grace. (5.1.291-95)

But reformation and forgiveness do not result in the inclusion into the humanity as defined by the gathering on the ship.

Similarly with Ariel, Prospero's pleasure in his performance does not eventuate in an invitation to voyage to Milan. Schlegel's identification of Ariel and Caliban with the elements of air and earth respectively still has resonance.[7] They are of different material and will pursue different destinies. To be human is to accept the range of good and evil, of foolishness and seriousness, and of power and inability that the visitors to the island have shown. While the play may reflect attitudes about colonialism and imperialism, it clearly is not about those topics, but rather about involvement in the humanity of kings and dukes, of treason and marriage, and the human qualities of forgiveness, engagement, and acceptance.

[7]Cited by Kermode in the Introduction to the Arden *Tempest* (lxxxi).

Reconstructing Richard: How Productions from 1700 to 1850 Transformed Shakespeare's *Richard III*"

Roger Ochse
Black Hills State University

The title of this paper promises results only a larger study can deliver. To keep my presentation within the allotted time, I will focus on how Colley Cibber's 1700 adaptation of Shakespeare's *Richard III* marked a defining passage in English theatre. I will argue that during the Restoration and Eighteenth Century the theater of illusion driven by spectacle attained its primacy on the stage, replacing Shakespeare's theater of the imagination driven by words. I will also argue that Cibber's use of visual effects divided objects and their meaning, thereby stripping his Shakespearean source of its historical context and focusing on Richard as the consummate stage villain.

"Theatre of the imagination driven by words" regards the text as primal; it employs what Ralph Alan Cohen calls the "primacy of words" to guide the production, using the printed text as a rubric to create dramatic speech that is, to use the terms of Giles Block: clear, natural, and eloquent.[1] Described by Martin White and Andrew Gurr, the Elizabethan theatre was defined by its architectural and acoustical shape of the wooden "O," with its sparse staging, elaborate costuming, and use of language to create the action.[2] Players and audience interacted in an open air amphitheatre modeled after the Roman Coliseum. This intimacy, in which the hearing "audience" shared in the natural light with the onstage action, defined Shakespeare's theatre of the imagination. After 1608, when the Blackfriars Theatre provided indoor staging with candlelit performances, this intimacy was retained in an even smaller

[1]Ralph Alan Cohen, "Shenandoah Shakespeare Guidelines for Productions," NEH Institute on Shakespeare's Theatres. Staunton, VA : July 2002. Giles Block, Presentation at NEH Institute on Shakespeare's Theatres (London : August 2002).

[2]Martin White, *Renaissance Drama in Action* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2002); Andrew Gurr, Playgoing in *Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987).

venue. Here part of the audience sat on stage, often interacting with the players.

"Theatre of illusion driven by spectacle" involves the primacy of the visual over the verbal. Today's audiences of Shakespeare in a sense look through the lens of twenty-first century mass media, where the visual predominates over the verbal. They live in an environment dominated by mass media where images overwhelm language, where one might argue that words are often reduced to manipulative "bites" rather than fully developed ideas. Television insists upon the primacy of images over text, enhances passive consumption, and cements our preference for immediate events over historical contemplation.[3] One could argue that contemporary viewers are not only turned into passive consumers of mass-produced commodities, but the images themselves are stripped of any reality

Guy Debord, in *The Society of Spectacle*, argues that there has been a total separation between the spectator and the thing viewed:

> The origin of the spectacle lies in the world's loss of unity, and its massive expansion in the modern period demonstrates how total this loss has been: the abstract nature of all individual work, as of production in general, finds perfect expression in the spectacle, whose very manner of being concrete is, precisely, abstraction. . . . Spectators are linked only in a one-way relationship to the very center that maintains their isolation from each other. The spectacle thus unites what is separate, but it unites it only in its separateness.[4]

This physical separation creates a psychological separation, whether in mass-produced images over television or cinema or in the "black box" theatre where the audience is in the dark invisible to the performance. The wholeness of verbal imagery has lost its cultural context. Spectacle elevates sight to the place occupied by touch in more unified cultures, and this removing of visual images from their original context may in fact be a Renaissance phenomenon to which Shakespeare was a major contributor.

To demonstrate the difference between word and image driven theater, I'd like to begin not with *Richard III* but with *Henry V* and the speech delivered by the Chorus at the beginning of the play (Prologue, 1-34). The Chorus speaks directly to the

[3] Steven Johnson, *Interface Culture: How New Technology Transforms the Way We Create and Communicate* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1997), 5.

[4] "Separation Perfected" in *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (1967; New York : Zone Books, 1994), 22

audience and asks us to use our imagination, to transform "this unworthy scaffold" or "cram / Within this wooden O" two mighty armies battling for supremacy at Agincourt. Even more revealing are the words chosen to describe this process: We and the Chorus are described as "ciphers to this great account," who must "Piece out" the players' "imperfections with your thoughts." "Think," we are told, "when we *talk* of horses, that you *see* them / Printing their proud hooves i' the receiving earth" (italics added for emphasis). What's more, we are asked to condense the sprawling events of history—"jumping o'er times, / Turning th' accomplishment of many years"—"Into an hourglass." The Chorus describes the hallmark of Shakespeare's performance text: it is a theatre of the imagination driven by words.

Now I'd like to fast-forward to 1989 and Kenneth Branagh's *Henry V*. The film opens not in The Globe but on a cluttered sound stage where the movie is being filmed. We begin in total darkness. Derek Jacobi plays the Chorus, striking a match to illuminate his speech, then walks down a small flight of steps to flip on a circuit breaker to light up the scene. The Chorus speaks into the camera, and by extension, us, taking us on location where *Henry V* is being shot. As he finishes his speech, "your humble patience pray / Gently to hear, kindly to judge, our play," he swings the doors open and the camera follows and we are drawn into darkness into the story space of the film itself, where the action begins.[5]

The Restoration saw the onset of the proscenium stage, seating the audience by descending seat price from front to rear of the auditorium. The division between stage action and spectators was made more complete by lighting the stage with lamps and leaving the audience in the dark, nearly invisible to the performance. These changes were not Cibber's invention, and certainly they had precursors before the Restoration, including the elaborate court masques of Inigo Jones in the early seventeenth century. Shakespeare had made more use of stage illusion in the Jacobean period, most notably in *Cymbeline* when Jupiter descends from the heavens riding on the back of an eagle and in *The Winter's Tale* where the statue moves, transforms itself into the live Hermione, and steps down to embrace Leontes. With the Restoration, Davenant's *Macbeth* (1674) revealed the court's preference for visual spectacle, flattening the protagonist in favor of displaying the three witches and their wicked magic. Dryden scaled down Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* to fit the conventions of the new Restoration staging. *All for Love* (1677) notably observed the unities of time, place, and action, and even more importantly toned down the verse

[5] Michael Greer, *Screening Shakespeare: Using Film to Understand the Plays* (New York: Pearson, 2004), 15.

in favor of tableaux of pathos, packaged for contemporary tastes in tragedy. Nahum Tate's *King Lear* (1680), with its notorious happy ending, also took the path of pathos over poetry, lingering over scenes of Lear's wretched condition and his relationship with Cordelia.

From these examples we can see that the shift from the verbal to the visual did not take place suddenly with Cibber. In fact, the delicate balance between words and images was always in process of deconstructing in Shakespeare. This disconnect between objects and their meaning is apparent in much of Shakespeare's drama, and makes for the incipient ambiguity we find in *Hamlet* where things are "out of joint," yet made right to an uncertain degree, or in *King Lear*, where the shallow establishment of order at the end does not redeem the lacerating fifth act and its relentless deconstruction of any semblance of social order. In Shakespeare's *Richard III*, the tensions aroused by the dramatic action are likewise unresolved, or resolved in such a heavy-handed way as to be suspect. The historical Richard is converted into a prop for Tudor mythology, melded into in a medieval morality play where our interest is focused on the protagonist's villainy. Richard's fall and Richmond 's ascendancy are almost disappointing, in spite of future assurances of Elizabeth's successful reign. Shakespeare's long, disjointed play of 3,600 lines in blank verse, stichomythic catalogs, and historically imbedded characters like Queen Margaret, invited adaptation.

Cibber's *Richard III* record as the most successful Shakespeare adaptation cannot be disputed; it held sway on the British and American stage for nearly 150 years, from 1700 to 1845. Even when Samuel Phelps "restored" the Shakespearean original, it still bore the unmistakable marks of Cibber. Afterward, Cibber's play, either in whole or in part, found its way into virtually every nineteenth and twentieth century production, including Laurence Olivier's 1955 movie version.

From 1700 to 1718 Cibber the play was altered three times. Prior to its initial production, the Master of the Revels expunged the entire first act, objecting to its presentation of the captivity and assassination of King Henry VI. In an especially revealing passage from Cibber's *Apology*, the playwright disputes the censor's decision on the basis of its harming the unity and dramatic design of the play itself, arguing that the historical elements are of no particular relevance. Charles Killigrew, the Master of the Revels, had insisted that the depiction of the defenseless and unfortunate King Henry in prison "would put weak People too much in mind of King

James [II]," which Cibber argues is rather a stretch by late 1699 or 1700.[6] Cibber did attempt to enhance the appeal of the play by adding the murder of the young princes in Act IV in full view of the audience. He later revised this scene extensively. The following table illustrates the three separate versions of the play as performed by Cibber and the Drury Lane Company:

Date(s)	Death of Henry VI	Onstage Murder of Princes
1700-ca. 1709	Cut	Included
Ca. 1710-1717	Added	Included
1718 onward	Included	Cut

Detailed comparisons between Cibber's adaptation and the original by Shakespeare have been given by Christopher Spencer and Scott Colley; they explain in elaborate detail the nature and extent of the alterations and additions.[7] Cibber's first edition, in fact, aids in this analysis through its carefully marking with quotation marks Shakespeare's lines. Cibber reduced Shakespeare's unwieldly Folio version of 3,600 lines (playing time: 3-5 hours) to a more compact and manageable play of 2,172 lines (playing time: 2 hours). To achieve this compression, Cibber cut the roles of Margaret, Clarence, the two Murderers, and King Edward IV, while at the same time incorporating additions from *3 Henry VI*, *2 Henry IV*, and *Richard II*. Except for misidentifying the famous line, "Off with his head, so much for Buckingham," as Shakespeare's, Cibber labels 754 lines as Shakespearean (nearly 35 percent). Their inclusion, however, does not restore their word-based impact in the face of what is clearly a visually-driven production.

To demonstrate my point, I will now focus on the scene in Act V before the Battle

[6] Colley Cibber, *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber* (1740; Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1968).

[7] Christopher Spencer, *Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare* (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1965); Scott Colley, *Richard's Himself Again: A Stage History of Richard III* (New York: Greenwood P, 1992).

of Bosworth, just as Richard awakens from seeing the ghosts of his murdered victims appear to him in a dream. Here is the passage from the Shakespeare 1623 First Folio version:

3639: Rich. Giue me another Horse, bind vp my Wounds:
3640: Haue mercy Iesu. Soft, I did but dreame.
3641: O coward Conscience? how dost thou afflict me?
3642: The Lights burne blew. It is not dead midnight .
3643: Cold fearefull drops stand on my trembling flesh.
3644: What? do I feare my Selfe? There's none else by,
3645: Richard loues *Richard*, that is, I am I.
3646: Is there a Murtherer heere? No; Yes, I am:
3647: Then flye; What from my Selfe? Great reason: why?
3648: Lest I Reuenge. What? my Selfe vpon my Selfe?
3649: Alacke, I loue my Selfe. Wherefore? For any good
3650: That I my Selfe, haue done vnto my Selfe?
3651: O no. Alas, I rather hate my Selfe,
3652: For hatefull Deeds committed by my Selfe.
3653: I am a Villaine: yet I Lye, I am not.
3654: Foole, of thy Selfe speake well: Foole, do not flatter.
3655: My Conscience hath a thousand seuerall Tongues,
3656: And euery Tongue brings in a seuerall Tale,
3657: And euerie Tale condemnes me for a Villaine;
3658: Periurie, in the high'st Degree,
3659: Murther, sterne murther, in the dyr'st degree,
3660: All seuerall sinnes, all vs'd in each degree,
3661: Throng all to'th' Barre, crying all, Guilty, Guilty.
3662: I shall dispaire, there is no Creature loues me;
3663: And if I die, no soule shall pittie me.
3664: Nay, wherefore should they? Since that I my Selfe,
3665: Finde in my Selfe, no pittie to my Selfe.
3666: Me thought, the Soules of all that I had murther'd
3667: Came to my Tent, and euery one did threat
3668: To morrowes vengeance on the head of *Richard*.[8]

Here is the passage as adapted by Cibber:

RICHARD

2060" ana="Shakespeare: Give me another Horse: Bind up my wounds!
2061: 'Have mercy, Heaven. Ha!-soft!-'Twas but a dream:
2062: But then so terrible, it shakes my Soul.
2063: Cold drops of sweat hang on my trembling Flesh,
2064: My blood grows chilly, and I freze with horror.
2065: O Tyrant Consciene! how dost thou aflict me!

[8] Shakespeare, William, *Richard III*, 1623, University of Virginia E-text Center, April 10, 2004 <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/ShaR3F.html>.

2066: When I look back, 'tis terrible Retreating:
2067: I cannot bear the thought, nor dare repent:
2068: I am but Man, and Fate, do thou dispose me.
2069: Who's there?
[*Enter Catesby.*]

CATESBY

2070" ana="Shakespeare: 'Tis I, my Lord; the Village Cock
2071" ana="Shakespeare: Has thrice done salutation to the morn:
2072" ana="Shakespeare: Your Friends are up, and buckle on their Armour.

RICHARD

2073: 'O Catesby! I have had such horrid dreams. --

CATESBY

2074: 'Shadows, my Lord, below the Soldier's heeding.

RICHARD

2075: Now, by my this days hopes, shadows to night
2076" ana="Shakespeare: Have struck more terror in the Soul of Richard,
2077" ana="Shakespeare: Than can the substance of ten Thousand Soldiers
2078" ana="Shakespeare: Arm'd all in Proof, and led by shallow Richmond .

CATESBY

2079: 'Be more your self, my Lord: Consider, Sir:
2080: 'Were it but known a dream had frighted you,
2081: 'How wou'd your animated Foes presume on't.

RICHARD
2082: Perish that thought: No, never be it said,
2083: That Fate it self could awe the Soul of Richard.
2084: Hence, Babling dreams, you threaten here in vain:
2085: Conscience avant; Richard's himself again.
2086: Hark! the shrill Trumpet sounds, to Horse: Away!
2087: My Soul's in Arms, and eager for the Fray. [*Exeunt.*][9]

The most obvious difference between the two Richards can be seen in the subtle psychomachia developed through Shakespeare's dramatic language and the flattened melodrama of Cibber's illusionary display. It should be noted that the debate within Richard's mind had just been introduced by the ghosts of Prince Edward, King Henry VI, Clarence, Rivers/Grey/Vaughan, Hastings, the two young princes, Lady Anne,

[9] Colley Cibber, *The Tragical History of King Richard III*, 1699, University of Virginia E-text Center, April 10, 2004 < http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/Cib3Ric.html>.

Buckingham, each in turn damning Richard and praising Richmond. Cibber includes only the ghosts of King Henry, the young princes, and his wife Ann, each speaking only to Richard. The balanced symmetry, part of Shakespeare's design, is replaced by an intense focus on Richard and his reaction to these visions.

The disintegration of language that drives Shakespeare's Richard is superceded by a more direct visualization of "tyrant conscience," a disposal to "fate," and a confession to Catesby (some in Shakespearean verse) that he has been afflicted by "horrid dreams." In the hands of skillful actors like Cibber, Garrick, and Kemble, and Cooke, all who performed this role during the eighteenth century, Richard could become the vehicle for spectacular moments of theatre. Cibber does not allow Richard to linger long in self-doubt; with the line "Richard's himself again," Richard resumes the melodramatic villain role more consistent with Cibber's and the audience's vision. As Scott Colley points out, "Shakespeare is at pains to demonstrate that Richard is not simply himself alone. The play moves from that point at which Richard assumes that he alone manipulates events to a point which it is momentarily clear, even to Richard, that events are determined elsewhere" (Colley 6). For Cibber, the invisible world where real ghosts inhabit the universe becomes mere "conscience," as his more transparent Richard takes on a mortal Richmond without having to contend with providential forces.

The ghost scene provides obvious opportunities for spectacle, both in Shakespeare's and Cibber's *Richard III.* In Shakespeare, however, words develop meaning for the audience, while in Cibber they merely accompany or reinforce the visual. Promptbooks from eighteenth and nineteenth century theatrical productions support this idea, particularly with regard to the ghost scene where the lights are dimmed and careful attention is paid to creating an illusion of ghostlike appearance for the audience. John Philip Kemble's promptbook (1811, Folger 11) calls for "Lamps down" at the beginning of the scene, with "Raise lamps a little" just before King Henry announces "The morning's dawn has summoned me away."[10] Then when Richard "starts up" from his dream, the stage lamps are quickly to be turned "quite up." Upon Catesby's entrance, Kemble writes in: "Starts into corner and sinks against 1st wing," indicating the actor's movement that will indicate his reaction to Richard's dream. George Frederick Cooke's copy (1808, Folger 4), written on a printed version (1793) as performed at Covent Garden in 1807, also reveals the penchant for visual spectacle, with "lamps lowered, all silent" before the ghost scene.

[10] Colley Cibber, *The Tragical History of King Richard III.* Prompt Copy of John Philip Kemble (1811)(Prompt RIII No. 11, Washington , DC : Folger Shakespeare Library, 1974.)

An engraving of the scene, most likely for the benefit of readers of the play, appears in the Cooke promptbook (Folger 4). Another promptbook dated 1840 (Folger 17) indicates the ghosts rise behind Richard's tent, backlit by lamps.

When Samuel Phelps restored Shakespeare's text in 1845 (Folger 24), and subsequently produced the "original" play four years later, it bore the unmistakable influence of Colley Cibber—only now with nearly half of the Shakespearean lines cut and radically rearranged to accommodate a three hour production time and an even greater emphasis on visual spectacle. For example, Buckingham's execution scene is completely eliminated, and the role of Margaret is severely reduced, as in the Cibber version. Even more revealing are the cuts in Richard's speech after he awakens from his ghostly dream:

> Richard loves Richard: that is, I am I.
> Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am:
> Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason why–
> Lest I revenge. What, myself upon myself?
> Alack, I love myself. Wherefore? For any good
> That I myself have done unto myself?
> O no! Alas, I rather hate myself
> For hateful deeds committed by myself.
> I am a villain. Yet I lie, I am not.
> Fool, of thyself speak well. Fool, do not flatter. (V.iii.184-193)

The intense introspective debate within his psyche is removed, leaving us with Richard's simpler comparison between his conscience and his accusers at the bar in criminal court. The primacy of visual effects is even more pronounced in the Phelps production. As the ghosts appear, we have the direction, "Lower Lights gradually Till the Ghosts ascend," is followed by "Let Gauzes begin to descend behind opening of trees" (between the opposing camps of Richard and Richmond). The ghosts were positioned behind the gauze, all top-lighted so as to create a special effect. In the larger and more technically advanced Sadler's Wells theatre (audience: 3,000) Phelps took spectacle to new levels, as he included these visually stunning scenes. The final battle scene featured an elaborately choreographed staging with dozens of actors symmetrically aligned on stage left and right, accompanied by rousing battle music.

To language-oriented Shakespeareans, Cibber and the other eighteenth century adapters have produced disappointing results. As students of literature we often assume that visual experience is of a lesser order than that of the spoken or written

word. Rudolf Arnheim and Marshall McLuhan regard the emergence of visual media as heralding new ways of thinking and knowing—not inferior to verbal perception but transforming our minds to new levels of consciousness. McLuhan states: "All media as extensions of ourselves serve to provide new transforming vision and awareness."[11] Colley Cibber appeared at a critical moment when words were giving way to images in the popular theatre, even at the same time a market was emerging for novels, even plays, for a reading public. The triumph of spectacle in eighteenth century theatre, marked most notably in Cibber's *Richard III*, marks a turning point which we now see as inevitable. With the technological advances in theatre came a distancing between players and audience, made possible to a large extent by interior lighting that could more readily enhance visual illusion. The language of wit and imagination has persisted in theatre—for example in the plays of Wilde and Shaw—but we are always aware that the setting is within the theatre. We are not asked to make an imaginative leap through words into the fields of Agincourt.

---

[11] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 23; Rudolph Arnheim, *Visual Thinking* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1969).

The Tempest: Discovering Comic Possibilities in the Shakespearean Text Through Performance

Jennifer Jacobson
Black Hills State University

Dealing with performance text in an undergraduate Shakespeare class is a daunting task for any student, much less for a professor whose class often must rely upon a combination of reading plays and viewing videos. This tandem approach somehow is lacking in sound pedagogy, since Shakespeare's plays were intended for performance--an activity not typically practiced in the classroom. How can one gain access to Shakespeare's dramatic language, without the requisite skills in acting or knowledge of the theatrical conventions of Elizabethan England? Above all, the plays of Shakespeare engage the theater of the imagination driven by words. How can students enter this dramatic world? What follows is a story of how one student discovered the comic possibilities in the Shakespearean text through performance.

Before proceeding, I should explain that the study was engaged by a group of four students enrolled in Shakespeare II (English 432) at Black Hills State University in Fall 2004. The roles were assigned as follows: Trinculo, Gretchen Brimm; Stephano, Sara Elias; Ariell, Melanie Shurtz; and Caliban, Jennifer Jacobsen.

After our initial readings of the scene, my group and I recognized many comic elements in the text, and more careful examination helped us identify those to bring into our performance. An analysis of the language and the stage direction found in the scene provided us with ideas about how the scene should be presented and allowed us to work out the staging. It was here that the true comic possibilities emerged. Since "Shakespeare's plays were intended for performance, not to be read as texts outside the context of the theater," it is obvious that the scene cannot be sufficiently understood without a performance of some sort.[1] Our study of the scene concluded with the review of the relevant scholarship on *The Tempest*. The study of

[1]Roger Ochse, "Digital Shakespeare: Integrating Texts and Technology," in *For All Time? Critical Issues in Teaching Shakespeare* (Kent Town, South Australia: Australian Association for the Teaching of English/Wakefield Press, 2002), 46.

the text as language and text as performance had enabled us to develop an adequate understanding of the scene and we were able to accept or refute the findings of experts regarding the play. This research served to broaden our understanding of the text as performance. By employing a study of the text as language, text as performance, and recent relevant scholarship, the comic possibilities found in the words of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* were discovered and brought out through a performance of Act 3 scene 2.

The first step towards uncovering the comic possibilities in the scene was a careful study of the language of the text. To begin a study of the language of one of Shakespeare's plays, the Folio and the quarto versions must be compared. However, since *The Tempest* only appeared in the Folio, comparing the versions was not an option. First, the text reveals that the characters are in a state of drunkenness. Stephano announces that Caliban "hath drown'd his tongue in sack" and he tells Cailban, "Thy eyes are almost set in thy head" (3.2.1359).[2] Their drunkenness naturally contributes to the comedy. Next, the invisibility of Ariell in relation to the other characters also becomes apparent through the language of the text. Of course, the limited Folio stage direction does announce, "Enter Ariell, invisible," informing the reader of the new character onstage (3.2.1392). Finally, it is through the language of the scene that the comic misunderstanding between the characters is revealed. While Caliban is describing to Stephano his hatred for Prospero, Ariell interjects "Thou liest," and Trinculo is blamed for the interruption.

After a study of the language of the printed text, we began to think about how action could be driven by the words to produce a coherent scene and make the comic elements in the text clear to the audience. Through preparing the scene for performance, words became speech; comic possibilities that lay hidden in the printed text unfolded as we entered the characters as players and interacted with one another on stage. It became clear in repeated rehearsals that the banter between the characters allows the audience as well as the actors to participate in the comic action. This interaction between players and audience is lost in a mere reading of the play; only through performance can the words and actions of the scene become fully human. Acting emotional or physical states like Stephano's and Caliban's anger at Trinculo and Trinculo's disgust with Caliban require acting out rather than passive reading.

Another aspect of the text as language that my group and I had to bring into the performance was the characters' drunkenness. Strategies we employed to convey their condition included slurred speech, inability to stand, and the display of empty bottles strewn about the stage. These verbal cues--all driven by the performance text--engaged the audience even if they might not understand every word.

The next comic element that added humor to the scene was the invisibility of

[2]Quotations of *The Tempest* are taken from the facsimile of the First Folio Edition (1623) available from the Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library (7 April 2004), <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/ShaTemF.html>.

Ariell. The stage direction calls for Ariell to enter and remain on stage invisible to the other characters, even though they can hear her when she chooses to speak. What is Ariell to do while the others are speaking and acting? We chose to have Ariell mock Stephano, Trinculo and Caliban and play subtle pranks on them. These antics kept the audience entertained while at the same time allowing for a creative way to keep Ariell on stage during the scene. Finally, to capitalize on humorous possibilities in the text we took words not common in our contemporary usage and exaggerated them for comic effect. When Caliban speaks of his plan for the murder of Prospero, he made gestures that would inform the audience of a definition of a word that may not be familiar. For instance, when the phrase "cut his wezand with thy knife" is spoken, Caliban moved his finger across Stephano's throat (3.2.1445).

After a study of the text as language and a performance of the scene, my group and I checked relevant criticism regarding *The Tempest*. Because we had spent a great deal of time engaged in rehearsals and study of the language, we felt confident enough in our understanding to be able to accept or refute the findings of experts on the subject. For instance, we concluded our scene with the exit of the characters. We thought that it would be humorous if Caliban exited last, even though he was instructed to lead the departure by Stephano. Our reasoning for this order was that Caliban would start to lead, but Stephano and Trinculo's pushy personalities would come out and Caliban would be pushed to the back of the line. James Smith reasons that when Stephano "Commands him to lead the pursuit . . . Caliban refuses, lagging disconsolately behind."[3] I would disagree that this scene ends with Caliban feeling discontented because he has what he wants: someone who has agreed to put an end to Prospero. Also, the entire scheme was his idea, why would he be unhappy? Sometimes this research helped us to fill in the gaps of our understanding when our questions were left unanswered after all of our study. One of these questions asked: How should the characters of Ariell and Caliban appear? Michael Baird Saenger proposes that these characters historically had an aquatic appearance.[4] However, my group and I decided to present Caliban and Ariell in a way that was unique to us.

In his critical study of *Macbeth*, Gary Waller states: "It is useful to think of acting, like reading and criticism, as a mode of producing, not merely reproducing, meanings, and to think of the Shakespearean script making the meaning only as it is loosed into the world as production."[5] As readers, players, and students, my group felt suspended between the historical *Tempest* as it is represented in print and historical productions, and the newly discovered world of possibilities we

[3]James Smith, "Caliban" in *Caliban*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea, 1992), 130.

[4]Michael Baird Saenger, "The Costumes of Caliban and Ariel qua Sea-Nymph," *Notes and Queries* 42 (1995): 334-36.

[5]Gary Waller, "The Play in Performance" in *Macbeth: A Guide to the Play*, ed. H. R. Coursen (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 139.

encountered in our theatrical experiment. One finding was certain: *The Tempest* would never the same for us whenever we revisited the text, either on the page or stage.

Adapting the Master: Joe Calarco and *Shakespeare's R &J*

Lysbeth Em Benkert
Northern State University

"Why not just do Shakespeare?" This is the question a colleague of mine posed a couple of years ago when Northern's theater department performed Joe Calarco's adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*: *Shakespeare's R&J.* It's a valid question, and one that seems to come up whenever someone fiddles around with Shakespeare's plays. After all, if Shakespeare is as good as we all say he is, why alter the text? Yet directors seem to have a compulsion to put their mark on the plays by cutting lines, re-arranging and adding scenes, and sometimes adding or deleting whole characters. As often as it's done, however, viewing audiences and Defenders of the Text demand that the changes be justified. Certainly, not all changes can be justified. We have all seen adaptations that fail (some of them spectacularly--I am not a big fan of *Prospero's Books*, for example). One of the most successful I have seen is Calarco's, successful because, while it separates us from our received notions of the play through its textual changes, it ensures that those alterations consistently support thematic concerns.

No adaptation comes away without some nit picking--even modern dress performances that leave the text unaltered come in for criticism. *Romeo and Juliet* has certainly seen its share of changes. Most performances in the 19th century followed David Garrick's adaptation which has Juliet wake up after Romeo has swallowed the poison but before he dies--a change which Bernard Shaw thought ridiculous, saying of it: "Romeo, instead of dying forthwith when he took the poison, was interrupted by Juliet, who sat up and made him carry her down to the footlights, where she complained of being very cold, and has to be warmed by a love scene, in the middle of which Romeo, who had forgotten all about the poison, was taken ill and died." [1] Yet, the change

[1] *Shaw on Shakespeare*, ed. Edwin Wilson (NY: Dutton, 1961), 246; quoted in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare: For All Time* (NY: Oxford, 2003), 219.

survived on the stage for over 100 years before being dropped, and the idea was revived a few years ago by Baz Luhrmann in *Romeo + Juliet*, though here, at least, Romeo doesn't get up and carry her off, but lies dying as Juliet says "drunk all and left no friendly drop to help me after?"

For some adapters, the challenge is to make the play seem fresh. It is almost impossible to watch *Romeo and Juliet* without bias. This is the play with which all of us are the most familiar, many having been forced to read it in the ninth grade. Half the audience can recite the balcony scene along with the actors--we are all either bored folks forced to come because it is Shakespeare and therefore good for us, or we are Shakespeare professors critiquing every gesture and syllable. For any performance to be successful, it has to either use that familiarity to its advantage, or it has to do something to make us see it as though it were a brand new play.

For film in the first part of the 20th Century, productions relied on pageantry to make the play seem new. George Cukor's 1936 version seems closely allied to Max Reihardt's *Midsummer Night's Dream* of a few years before. Costumes are extravagantly lush--the men dressed in rich velvets and Juliet's dresses loaded with intricate beadwork. Whenever the prince arrives he comes on horseback with a company of sharply dressed men with flags flying. Cukor leaves the text largely unaltered, relying on the glitter to dazzle his audience into seeing with new eyes.

In the 50s, Renato Castellani's alterations take an opposite approach, seeming to focus his directorial choices on ways through which to make the play feel familiar. Juliet looks like a young Donna Read, and Romeo resembles Frankie Avalon. The violence inherent in the play is blunted and drained of its emotional shock. The love scenes are full of longing looks and very little else--they don't even get to embrace at their marriage as Romeo is on one side of the monastery grate and Juliet on the other. All they get is a short, chaste kiss through the grill. The parents even seem slightly buffoonish--Capulet's anger at Juliet has slightly comic overtones as we listen to him rage from the other side of the door while Juliet waits in the hall. This is Wonderbread Shakespeare, non-threatening, accessible, parentally approved. Another colleague, in fact, tells me that this was the version they watched at her Catholic high school.

Not so with Franco Zeffirelli's version in 1969. This version still gets high school English teachers in trouble as they try to quickly fast-forward through the brief nudity. Zeffirelli wants us to see the play as we had not seen the play before, by what was, up to that point, a pretty revolutionary casting idea--having teenagers play the lead roles. For generations, Juliet had been deemed too difficult for a novice actor. In the 1750s, Lewis Hallam's mother played Juliet to his Romeo. In both the Cukor and the Castellani version, Juliet and her mother look more like sisters than mother and daughter, something that

post-Zeffirelli, looks unnatural. Zeffirelli's decision, because it was so unexpected, allowed audiences to see the story from a new perspective, and completely altered audience prejudices about how the play should be performed. Post-Zeffirelli, no production can cast a 35-year-old Juliet.

Baz Luhrman's film in 1996, once again tries to de-familiarize us with the play, attempting to distance us from the familiar and comfortable Shakespeare that both discourages attentive viewing and scares away teenage viewers. Here the violence is emphasized in a way it had not been before by the introduction of guns and a chaotic urban setting. At the same time Luhrman blunts the emotional threat of violence through an ironic filter--the opening fight scene seems initially comic in a snide old-west-with-hair-gel way. Tybalt postures like a spaghetti-western Mexican, while the camera occasionally fast forwards the action for a few seconds in the manner of a cartoon. In his own way, Luhrman succeeded in much the same way that Zeffirelli did--he forced viewers to see the play anew, and reactions to the film were strong, both positively and negatively. Luhrman made us pay attention, but whether we liked it or not is another thing entirely.

Joe Calarco's adaptation came under particular scrutiny from my colleague because Calarco's changes to the original, at first glance, seem a little odd. His changes, like those of Luhrman, work hard to distance the viewer from our received notions of the play. He adds a frame to the text which places specific limitations on the remainder of the performance. The first scene opens on four teenage boys going through the motions of a parochial school day--in uniform, they recite lessons from classes in Latin, religion and the proper social roles of men and women. After the school bell rings, they sneak off and pull out a copy of *Romeo and Juliet* that has been stashed in an old trunk wrapped in a long, red cloth. The boys act out the play both for recreation and as an act of rebellion--they clearly are not supposed to be reading this stuff. This means that the entire play is acted by only four actors with no props but the book, the red cloth and a few blocks that can be moved around to serve as chairs, tables, or walls. Each actor must take on multiple roles, and, by necessity, all parts are played by male actors dressed in school sweaters and ties.

This immediately places the viewers off guard--what is this story about, Romeo and Juliet or these boys? Ultimately, it is about both, as we see the Shakespeare play not through our jaded perspective, but through the eyes of these young, first time readers. We see them get hooked by the initial appeal of the violence (they are boys, after all); we snicker at their first awkwardness about playing female roles; we feel their shock as the two lovers kiss for the first time; and we watch their ultimate commitment to full participation in the lives of the characters.

The all-male casting particularly forces viewers to re-think their notions about the female characters. In most productions, Lady Capulet is dismissed

as an overbearing, somewhat silly mother, and the nurse is a convenient clown, a working class girl who just wants to make sure Juliet gets laid and large fortune. In Calarco's adaptation it becomes clear that the women have learned a particular kind of strength needed to survive in a male world. Perhaps this interpretation is thrown into such relief because the public space is so strongly gendered male that the contrast between the domestic and public spaces is stark. The humor is sexually charged and borders on misogynistic, while the Montagues and Capulets live by a male code of conduct that demands violent response to any show of disrespect. While the domestic space separates itself from that social code, women clearly have to develop strategies to survive in conjunction with it, and often participate in the culture of violence. Calarco himself remarks on this in the introduction to the script: "We were astonished, though maybe we shouldn't have been, at how strong these women are. They were written as powerhouses. Our twentieth century view of women has caused us to play them weakly; they are not written that way."[2] It is unfortunate that the roles have to be played by men in order for us to see that, but through distancing the audience and actors from our preconceptions about how these roles should be played, we can re-evaluate our prejudices about the characters.

A director can, however, successfully distance us from previous readings of a play but still fail to tell the story well (again, I guess I would list *Prospero's Books* as one of these). "Distancing" the audience is the easy part--all kinds of bizarre notions have strutted across the stage. As I write this a director in Nevada is planning a *Midsummer Night's Dream* in which all of the fairies are Las Vegas showgirls. Northern once staged a post-nuclear *Richard III*, which was only mostly successful. Finding a gimmick is easy. The difference for me between a failure and a successful adaptation is whether the changes in the text support specific thematic threads. As I say this, it seems to be a grandiose statement of the obvious, but having watched seven different movie adaptations of *Romeo and Juliet* in the last few weeks, it does not seem to be all that obvious to the directors. The 1954 Castellani production seems particularly guilty of this. All of the director's changes seem to work toward blunting thematic and emotional impact, rather reinforcing them. The parents are generally well meaning if slightly hasty and a little hot-tempered. The friar is a little bumbling but kindly. We don't even really get to blame fate, since nearly all of the lines that blame Fortune are cut. Romeo and Juliet are just two teenagers in love who have a sorry run of bad luck.

Zeffirelli's adaptation succeeds not just because of his revolutionary casting, but because both his casting and his textual alterations support a specific thematic reading of the play, albeit a streamlined one. A particular

---

[2] Calarco, 8.

"And never shall my harp thy praise forget": *Anaphora, Anamnesis,* and the Reader in Book 3 of *Paradise Lost*

Nicholas Wallerstein
Black Hills State University

In the beginning of his famous book, *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in* Paradise Lost, Stanley Fish lays out his thesis:

> (1) the poem's centre of reference is its reader who is also its subject; (2) Milton's purpose is to educate the reader to an awareness of his position and responsibilities as a fallen man, and to a sense of the distance which separates him from the innocence once his; (3) Milton's method is to re-create in the mind of the reader (which is, finally, the poem's scene) the drama of the Fall, to make him fall again exactly as Adam did and with Adam's troubled clarity, that is to say, "not deceived."[1]

Furthermore, Fish argues that "the uniqueness of the poem's theme—man's first disobedience and the fruits thereof—results in the reader's being simultaneously a participant in the action and a critic of his own performance" (ix). Indeed, Fish—quoting Richard Bernard—goes so far as to say "Milton's intention differ[s] little from that of so many devotional writers, 'to discover to us our miserable and wretched estate through corruption of nature'" (ix). I propose that Fish's basic premise is flawed. His contention that the poem's primary theme is to force the reader to recapitulate Adam's fall disregards the very real ways in which the poem is an act of Christian prayer which the reader participates in. In fact, in parts, the poem becomes for the reader an actual act of Christian worship, not just a reliving of damnation and humiliation, as Fish would have it. Using eucharistic theology and rhetorical theory, I shall show how—in the Angelic Chorus of Book 3—Milton offers a way out of the reader's participation in his or her own demise, and thus argue for a reversal of Fish's primary thrust, that the poem's primary "progamme" is "reader

---

[1] *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in* Paradise Lost (London: Macmillan, 1967), 1.

harassment" (4).[2]

To begin with, there was nothing really new 38 years ago—when his book was published—in Fish's concept of the reader's being a participant in the action of a poem; the concept of reader participation was a commonplace in Renaissance literary theory. In his article "Reading Milton Rhetorically," Thomas Sloane suggests the following:

> Those critics for whom rhetorical analysis means an examination of style seldom give much attention to style as a strategy on the reader. . . . They separate considerations of style from the process whereby a reader finds the thought. . . . Certainly these analyses have extended considerably our knowledge of *elocutio*. But insofar as they omit *the reader's interaction* with a text they stop short of rhetorical reading. Should not a rhetorical reading show how the reader's mind is led toward the discovery of thought that has been, one should assume, strategically adorned, clothed, or ornamented?[3]

Understanding the importance of rhetorical reading is crucial, Sloane believes, because, as he puts it in his article "Rhetoric, 'Logic' and Poetry: The Formal Cause," "Rhetoricians, not aestheticians, still set the major tone for literary interpretation in Milton's day."[4] And chief among rhetorical elements is "invention." Sloane has argued that "invention" in the rhetorical act—invention being the first "office" of rhetorical composition—is not merely engaged in by the poet, but by the reader as well. That is, the reader must come *to* the meaning of the poem just as the poet must come up *with* the meaning of the poem. Sloane maintains, in fact, that

> From Wyatt to Dryden poets created and their readers read primarily by means of *inventio*—and *inventio* is a rhetorical art, connected with and conveying rhetoric's deep view of discursive meaning as a compound of speaker, speech, and audience, and of intention as a construct of convention and expectation. ("Reading" 396)

Sloane even more explicitly connects the Renaissance writer and reader in the following quotation. What makes a reading rhetorical is not

---

[2] This article is a continuation and revision of a study I began a decade ago, "'The Copious Matter of My Song': A Study of Theology and Rhetoric in Milton's *Paradise Lost* and 23rd Sonnet," *Pacific Coast Philology* 30.1 (1995): 42–58.

[3] "Reading Milton Rhetorically" in *Renaissance Eloquence*, James J. Murphy, ed. (Berkley: U of California P, 1983), 398. Emphasis mine.

[4] "Rhetoric, 'Logic' and Poetry: The Formal Cause" in *The Age of Milton: Backgrounds to Seventeenth-Century Literature*, C.A. Patrides and Raymond B. Waddington, eds. (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1980), 307.

> The demonstration of rhetorical influences . . . [but] the centering through the text on the *poet-reader relationship*. To put the matter stylistically, rhetorical reading presupposes a certain attitude toward language: language reflects a speaker's designs as he confronts an audience, who he assumes are not possessed of *tabulae rasae* but of minds filled with associations, conventions, expectations, which he must direct, control, or take advantage of. ("Reading" 398; my emphasis)

We see here that Sloane does not refute Fish—nor indeed is that his intention. But what we do observe is that reader-response was already on the minds of Renaissance poets, long before Fish "invented" the critical technique.

This perspective allows us as readers to find examples in *Paradise Lost* in which the reader participates in the poem in ways other than Fish's negative concentration on sin. For there is the more positive action of praise, and I shall offer an example where Milton seems quite aware that his language produces an environment in which not only Milton himself is found participating in praise, but the reader as well.

I contend that Milton is able to produce this environment because of his subtle awareness of *form*. Indeed, in arguing that the angelic chorus of Book 3 has the form of eucharistic prayer, I hope to show that Milton's use of form provides a salvific response in the reader, not a Fishian hopeless one. Form is very important in Renaissance conceptions of rhetoric. In fact, Sloane argues "[I]n the rhetorical view form is a detachable element in any discourse, one that should be carefully examined for its own special efficacy and impact" ("Rhetoric" 307). Of course, in any age, form is of rhetorical significance. Kenneth Burke has argued in *Counter-Statement* that a central element of rhetorical form is the setting up of expectation in the reader: "Form would be the psychology of the audience. Or, seen from another angle, form is the creation of an appetite in the mind of the auditor, and the adequate satisfying of that appetite."[5] Both Sloane's and Burke's perspectives on rhetorical form will help us understand how Milton forces the reader into participation in the Angelic Chorus, thereby surprising us not by our own predilection for sin, but surprising us by our natural (in the Christian view) desire to praise God. Indeed, we are mostly surprised by the fact of how easy such praise is. This is profoundly ironic since it is Satan himself who tells us how easy it is to praise God, despite the fact that he himself cannot, due to his pride. As he says in Book 4, "What could be less then to afford him praise, / The easiest recompence, and pay him thanks, / How due!"[6] What Satan fails at, the reader will succeed at, at least in the one instance we shall view. For Fish, we are always failing with Satan, dropping into sin. Here we shall find one reversal of the Fishian model.

[5] *Counter-Statement*, 2nd ed. (Los Altos, CA: Hermes, 1953), 30-31.

[6] Book 4, lines 46-8. All quotations from *Paradise Lost* will be from the text edited by Roy Flannagan (New York: Macmillan, 1993). Further references will be made in the text.

When we first approach lines 372–415 in Book 3 of *Paradise Lost*, we see immediately that there is a definite form to the passage. The passage is, in fact, in the form of a *hymn*, a "generic term," explains J. William Thompson, "given to vocal praise in the Bible."[7] In a more specific Christian context, Thompson notes that a hymn is a "Christian song . . . used in worship, to instruct in the faith, and to express joy" (681-2). We are aware that the passage is a hymn because, just before the passage begins, we read that the angels—beginning their worship and praise of God and the Son—are taking up their golden harps, and "with Praeamble sweet / Of charming symphonie they introduce / Their sacred Song" (ll. 367–9). The first line of their "Song" reads "Thee Father first they sung omnipotent" (l. 372) and moves along for 44 lines of continuous angelic chorus in praise of God and the Son, a chorus that Milton himself enters at line 410, finishing off the hymn six lines later.

But I will argue that the angelic chorus possesses not merely the obvious form of a hymn but also the form of eucharistic prayer as well, deeply embedded in it. That the form of the hymn is essentially one of eucharistic prayer has enormous theological and rhetorical implications—perhaps the most intriguing of which is the possibility that Milton uses the form of eucharistic prayer not only to turn the angelic chorus into a personal act of Christian worship for himself but also to allow his reader to participate in this act of worship as well. The chorus's allusions to eucharistic prayer are subtle, to be sure—especially considering the fact that no mention is made of the Host, one of the fundamental elements in eucharistic prayer. But I argue that the allusions do exist, lending a definite eucharistic form to the chorus.

According to D.E. Saliers, liturgical theology has isolated certain key concepts in eucharistic prayer that give it its special shape and meaning. These are (1) *anamnesis*, or remembering; (2) *epiclesis*, or invocation; (3) *eucharistia*, or thanksgiving; (4) *berakah*, or blessing and praise; (5) *oblatio*, or offering; and (6) sacrifice.[8] All of these elements put together make up the *anaphora*, as eucharistic prayer is called in the Eastern Church, or the "Canon of the Mass" or "Prayer of Consecration" in the Western Church.

Before we look at how these six elements of anaphora or eucharistic prayer are sprinkled throughout the angelic hymn of Book 3, let us first place the hymn in context with those portions of the poem that precede it. The context of the chorus is quite clear: God has asked for a sacrifice to be made in payment for the sins of the new human race, someone to "pay / The rigid satisfaction, death for death" (ll. 211–12). The Son offers himself to redeem the human race, exhibiting his Kenotic

[7] "Hymn," *Holman Bible Dictionary*, Trent C. Butler, ed. (Nashville: Holman, 1991), 681.

[8] "Liturgical Theology," *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*, Alan Richardson and John Bowden, eds. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 336-37.

love—he will humbly empty himself of his godhead,[9] become a human through the incarnation, suffer and die for man:

> . . . I for his sake will leave
> Thy bosom, and this glorie next to thee
> Freely put off, and for him lastly dye
> Well pleased, on me let Death wreck all his rage. (ll. 238–41)

We then arrive at the passage under consideration here, where the angels begin their worship and praise of the Son's great sacrifice. They take up their golden harps, and "with Praeamble sweet / Of charming symphonie they introduce / Thir sacred Song" (ll. 367–9). At this point, the hymn or chorus of the angelic host begins, starting with the praise of God:

> Thee Father first they sung Omnipotent,
> Immutable, Immortal, Infinite,
> Eternal King; thee Author of all being,
> Fountain of Light. (ll. 372–5)

This first part of the angelic hymn displays one of the central aspects of anaphora: commemoration of God's past beneficence throughout the history of salvation, and that which flows naturally from this commemoration: thanksgiving and praise. Throughout liturgical history, the form and content of the anaphora have changed and evolved, but in the Eastern Church, with its liturgy of Saints Basil the Great and John Chrysostom, as well as in the Roman Church, the anaphora has historically begun with the commemoration of creation itself.[10] Notice, therefore, that Milton's angelic hymn mimics this creational content, as the hymn refers to God as the "Author of all being" and the "Fountain of Light," both obvious allusions to Genesis 1 and its creation story. Thus the angelic hymn begins in quite anaphoristic fashion with its praise of God's creative activities.

After the hymn has addressed God, the Son is introduced, and he is the subject of the remainder of the hymn, 33 lines out of a total of 44 lines—exactly three quarters of the hymn being devoted to him. The section begins by drawing the direct connection between the Son and the Father:

---

[9] This is the literal translation of the term *kenosis*, a "self emptying," from the Greek *κενόω*. Kenosis is "used to indicate the nature of God's condescension in incarnation. Kenotic love is constitutive of God's being. Expressed through reciprocal divine-human self-giving in Christ, God's love overcomes evil and creates salvation through death and resurrection" (George Newlands, "Kenosis" in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 316).

[10] There are various sources that provide the history of Christian liturgy. See, for instance, Dom Benedict Steuart, *The Development of Christian Worship* (London: Longman, 1953).

> Thee next they sang of all Creation first,
> Begotten Son, Divine Similitude,
> In whose conspicuous count'nance, without cloud
> Made visible, th' Almighty Father shines. (ll. 383–6)

Soon thereafter, similar to the commemoration, thanksgiving, and praise of *God's* beneficence that we have already seen, the hymn commemorates the Son's beneficence, especially his saving acts:

> No sooner did thy dear and onely Son
> Perceive thee purpos'd not to doom frail Man
> So strictly, but much more to pitie enclin'd,
> He to appease thy wrauth, and end the strife
> Of Mercy and Justice in thy face discern'd,
> Regardless of the Bliss wherein hee sat
> Second to thee, offerd himself to die
> For mans offence. (ll. 403–10)

Immediately following this section in which the angels have praised the Son, Milton, apparently unable to control his passion any further, enters the chorus, and finishes the hymn with his own words of thanksgiving and praise:

> O unexampl'd love,
> Love no where to be found less then Divine!
> Hail Son of God, Saviour of Men, thy Name
> Shall be the copious matter of my Song
> Henceforth, and never shall my Harp thy praise
> Forget, nor from thy Fathers praise disjoine. (ll. 410–15)

The angelic hymn exerts most of its energies toward the commemoration, thanksgiving, and praise of the Son, both through the words of the angels and also through the words of Milton himself. This is perfectly in keeping with the traditional form and content of anaphora. Joseph Martos explains the central position of Christ in eucharistic theology:

> The eucharist . . . resonates with overtones of the great christological doctrines, for in traditional theology Christ is the incarnation of God, the living Word spoken in human history who became flesh and blood in order to accomplish the redemption of the world. It is in this dimension that the eucharist lives up to its name of being a "thanksgiving," a praising of the Father for the redemption wrought by the Son, and a thanking of both for the Spirit who has

been released into history through the salvific sacrifice of Christ on the cross.[11]

We could add to this that, although some anaphoras (as discussed earlier) have creational content, some—such as the anaphora of Hippolytus—direct almost all of their attention to the works of Christ. Milton's hymn seems more of less in the Byzantine or Roman mode, with its heavy emphasis on the works of Christ, with some initial creational content as well.

At this point, I would like to focus our attention on the final six lines of the hymn, where Milton himself has entered the chorus. For it is in these six lines that the angelic hymn draws its closest resemblance to the form of eucharistic prayer. We have already discussed the central emphasis in eucharistic prayer on the concept of commemoration, and surely it is with these six lines that Milton most self-consciously and forcefully develops a sense of commemoration in the hymn, especially in the final three-and-a-half lines, which I repeat:

> thy Name
> Shall be the copious matter of my Song
> Henceforth, and never shall my Harp thy praise
> Forget, nor from thy Fathers praise disjoine. (ll. 412–15)

The most striking element of commemoration here lies in the *litotes* "never forget," a figurative way of using dramatic understatement to say "I will remember." What we have here, I believe, is a clear representation of the most important aspect of commemoration in eucharistic prayer, the *anamnesis*. Anamnesis, meaning "memorial," or more literally, "a calling to mind" (from the Greek *ana-* + *mimneskein*), refers to two kinds of commemoration in the anaphora. One is the commemoration we have been discussing, the general remembering of God's beneficence throughout the *Heils-geschichte,* or salvation history, culminating in Christ's saving acts. The other, more specific, denotes that part of the anaphora in which the words of institution of the eucharist are introduced, recalling Christ's words in the Upper Room at the Last Supper, "Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you. . . ." And then referring to the wine, "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for you and many for the remission of sins."[12]

These two commands lead up, of course, to the third crucial command, "This do for my anamnesis." More fully translated, this phrase reads "This do in remembrance

[11] "Eucharistic Theology" in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 190.

[12] Some Bibles use the phrase "*new* testament" or "*new* covenant." However, as Stephen Harris points out, many scholars now believe that "[t]he adjective *new,* not present in the earliest manuscripts, was added later to emphasize the change in God's relationship with humankind. (Most modern English translations, including the New Revised Standard Version, the New Jerusalem Bible, and the Revised English Bible, omit the interpolated 'new' and use 'covenant' instead of 'testament' in this passage)," *The New Testament: A Student's Introduction*, 4th ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2002), 9.

of me," or "Do this as my memorial."[13] Aiden Kavanagh addresses the theological implications of this part of the eucharistic prayer:

> It is the institution account, ending with words "Do this for my *anamnesis,*" which gives rise to the second anaphoral aspect of commemoration: an overt textual statement that the eucharistic liturgy is now obeying that dominical command as it remembers the Lord's saving acts.[14]

It is my contention that at lines 414 and 415 Milton is now obeying that dominical command, for he is clearly stating that it is his absolute intention to remember, and always to remember, or as he puts it "and never . . . forget." The anamnesis is complete; and hence at least this section of the poem perhaps becomes for Milton a subtle form of Christian worship—a form of worship in which not only Milton can participate, but the reader as well.

Holding firm to the memory of Christ, as Milton is doing here—and having the reader do so as well—has deep roots in the Church. Luke Timothy Johnson writes of commemoration:

> When we speak of the memory of Jesus *in* the Church, we do not mean simply a mechanical recall of information from the past. We mean, rather, the sort of memory expressed by the Greek term *anamnesis*. . . . It is a recollection of the past that enlivens and empowers the present as well. Such memory is not restricted to the mental activity of individuals; it is found above all in the ritual and verbal activity of communities. . . . Anamnesis in earliest Christianity had a further complexity, for the one remembered from the past was also being experienced as present here and now.[15]

Milton's declaration at the end of the angelic chorus that he will never forget to sing Christ's praise is deeply rooted in traditional forms of commemoration, of anamnesis, and is far from being merely an "apostrophe put in the form of an authorial aside," as the Flannagan maintains in his edition (228, n. 116). It is one of Milton's great

[13] The translation "Do this as my memorial," rather than more common translations such as "Do this in remembrance of me," is a superior translation, according to Fritz Chenderlin, S.J., who argues forcefully for it in his book *"Do This as My Memorial": The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Anamnesis in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1982).

[14] "Anamnesis" in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 18. There are numerous other discussions available concerning the Last Supper, the institution of the eucharist, and the concept of anamnesis. See, for instance, Albert Descamps, *Jesus et L'Eglise: Etudes D'Exegese et de Theologie* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1987); "The Last Supper" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 234–41; and "The Lord's Supper" in *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible,* Walter A. Elwell, ed., 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 2:1352–55.

[15] *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 114-15. Johnson's emphasis.

moments of passion in the poem, and is quite distinct in its theological overtones.

There is not time here fully to expand on the implications of anamnesis as it is carried on throughout the rest of the poem, but we could at least make mention of a few of the other examples of memory that seem significant. There is, for instance, the close of Book 6, where Raphael admonishes Adam concerning God's command not to eat of the forbidden fruit, comparing the situation to the disobedience of the fallen angels:

> Let it profit thee to have heard
> By terrible Example the reward
> Of disobedience; first they might have stood,
> Yet fell; *remember,* and fear to transgress. (ll. 909–12; my emphasis)

We also have a repetition of this admonition later, in Book 8, when God warns Adam:

> *Remember* what I warne thee, shun to taste,
> And shun the bitter consequences: for know,
> The day thou eat'st thereof, my sole command
> Transgrest, inevitably thou shalt dye. (ll. 327–30; my emphasis)

And in Book 10, the Epic Voice speaks, again repeating the consequences of not remembering:

> For still they knew, and ought to have still *remember'd*
> The high Injunction not to taste that Fruit,
> Whoever tempted; which they not obeying,
> Incurr'd, what could they less, the penaltie,
> And manifold in sin, deserv'd to fall. (ll. 12–16; my emphasis)

A pattern begins to emerge that illustrates the deleterious effects of forgetting, of not remembering—lending to Milton's plea in the chorus of Book 3 (that he will never forget) great moral, spiritual, and intellectual importance and force. Milton seems exceptionally aware that Adam and Eve *do* fail to remember, and this failure becomes part of the dynamics of the poem. After all, what occurs in Book 9 when Eve goes off to work in the garden alone before the Fall? Milton's narration describes her has being "mindless the while" (l. 431). Let us not forget that anamnesis literally means "to call to mind." Here she is clearly not calling to mind what she should be. Eve is not fulfilling her moral, spiritual, and intellectual duty to call to mind God's command that she obey him. She is failing at anamnesis.

The same thing happens to Adam in *his* fall in Book 9: "while Adam took no thought." This is very similar to Eve's being "mindless the while." Perhaps when Milton enters the angelic chorus in Book 3, he is saying that he has learned from the

central, crucial mistake of Adam and Eve, that they failed to remember, that they failed to call to mind that which they should have. Failure to exercise anamnesis: it is this that leads to their downfall—their forgetting to obey, and it is not going to happen to Milton himself. And not just Milton, but his reader as well; Milton's reader will indeed *not* be surprised by sin. Because of the doctrine of anamnesis, we see that Fish's concept is in trouble.

But why would Milton's participation in anamnesis allow the *reader* to participate in anamnesis, and thereby avoid sin? We can look to the reader's participation in the hymn, and the reader's participation in the creation of the meaning of discourse. I contend that Milton adds to his poem elements of the form of eucharistic prayer precisely so that his reader may participate in the sacred remembrance of anamnesis. Ritual is based on form, and Milton's use of form in this particular part of the poem allows for a highly ritualized interaction between author and reader, and between reader and theme, and reader and meaning.

It is through Milton's use of form in the angelic chorus—grafting on to the hymn the form of eucharistic prayer—that Milton's reader is allowed to share in the commemorative activity in which Milton and the angels are engaged. Milton's particular use of form insists that the reader come to the text in a particular way. As the reader reads the angelic chorus, the reader too takes part in the anaphora. Through the particular use of form, Milton is thus able to guide reader response, participation, and experience—and therefore guide the reader toward salvation, not damnation. The reader may be surprised, but by sacred memory and praise—not by sin.

Marvell's Poetry and *The Serpent's Kiss*

Bruce Brandt
South Dakota State University

In his introduction to the published screenplay of *The Serpent's Kiss*, Tim Rose Price reminisces about first reading Marvell's "The Garden" while sitting in a garden at his school: "This particular garden was like no other, somehow. It was a privilege to enter it, in every sense. 'The Garden' was the same. I did not understand it--I still do not--but sitting in the sunlight I felt an extraordinary thrill, almost sexual" (5).[1] Clearly Price's visceral reaction to Marvell has endured. Allusions to Marvell's poetry suffuse *The Serpent's Kiss* from beginning to end, and they are never merely bookish or "period-appropriate" decorations. Rather, they provide its very heart. The film's explorations of vanity, desire and sexuality, illusion and reality, order and chaos, and nature are filtered through an intensive engagement with Marvell's poetry, and Price captures for us the vitality and eroticism that he first felt on reading Marvell.

Since *The Serpent's Kiss* is not widely known, a brief synopsis may be useful. The film is set in 1699 on a secluded country estate recently acquired by Thomas Smithers (Pete Postlethwaite), the owner of a foundry that specializes in the manufacture of cannons. The grounds are not landscaped, and Smithers has hired what he believes is the prestigious Dutch firm of Larousse and Chrome to transform this wilderness into a formal garden. He sees himself as doing this to please his wife Juliana (Greta Scacchi) although we soon perceive that it is more a mark of his own vanity. However, the "Meneer Chrome" (Ewan McGregor) who arrives to design the garden is an imposter who has been recommended by the movie's villain, Juliana's cousin James Fitzmaurice (Richard E. Grant), who desires Juliana for himself.[2] "Chrome"

---

[1]*The Serpent's Kiss*, directed by Philippe Rousselot and starring Ewan McGregor, Greta Scacchi, Pete Postlethwaite, Richard E. Grant, and Carmen Chaplin, was first released in 1997. This article is based on the DVD released in 2001 and the published screenplay by Tim Rose Price (London: Orion Media, 1998).

[2]The character is naturally called Chrome by the other characters, who believe that he is the real Chrome, and the screenplay refers to him as Chrome. We never learn his true name, and since he is an imposter, I have consistently enclosed his name in quotation marks. However, since "Thea" is not a disguise but the name that Anne has chosen for herself, I use Thea (no quotation marks) as her name.

is in fact a capable designer, deeply knowledgeable of horticulture and garden design and a passionate believer in the order represented by the formal garden in opposition to the chaos of nature, but his true task is to create a garden so expensive that it will bankrupt Smithers. Emotional complications develop as both Juliana and the Smithers' daughter Anne, who calls herself Thea (Carmen Chaplin), find themselves attracted to "Chrome," and he falls in love with Thea. She is emblematic of wilderness and nature, and thus in many ways his opposite. Her parents perceive her as psychologically unbalanced, a condition that they blame on her obsessive reading of Marvell's poetry.

The film's rich engagement with Marvell is established in the opening scene, which the screenplay describes in great detail: "As the TITLE FADES the SCREEN becomes a sea of green--shimmering, unfocused. The horizon ripples." We hear a young woman's voice in voice-over: "I'm standing on the shore of a green sea. There's a buzzing in my head. I can't focus. I'm wearing a white dress. I feel I want to dive in until I drown." The image slowly resolves into "a line of MEN coming relentlessly towards CAMERA. Soft focus, waist-high green all around the brown naked torsos. The speaker continues: "Then suddenly there are men wading towards me. Their bodies shiny and wet. There are flashes of brightness deep in the water like darting fish." On screen we can now tell that the men are not wet from the sea but from sweat. "They are REAPERS scything the meadow grass for hay. Each has his own rhythm, but the whole forms a slow dance of death. The flash of scythes slice deep in the meadow grass" (11). This conflation of sea and meadow derives from Marvell's *Upon Appleton House*, where the narrator describes looking out over a meadow:

> To see men through this meadow dive
> We wonder how they rise alive;
> As under water, none does know
> Whether he fall through it or go;
> But as the mariners that sound
> And show upon their lead the ground,
> They bring up flowers to be seen,
> And prove they've at the bottom been.
>
> No scene that turns with engines strange
> Does oft'ner than these meadows change
> For when the sun the grass hath vexed,
> The tawny mowers enter next;
> Who seem like Israelites to be
> Walking on foot through a green sea
> To them the grassy deeps divide,

And crowd a lane to either side. (ll.377-392)[3]

The film's visual adaptation of this Marvellian imagery is stunning, with the sea transforming into the green sea of the meadow and the mariners metamorphosing into reapers. The film recurs to this imagery in the ending, in which Thea and "Chrome" are lying on a beach, and a line of reaper-like fisherman are wading through the water with their nets.

The opening allusion to *Upon Appleton House* extends on to the poem's next stanza, which describes a mower's unwittingly killing a rail that was nesting in the grass. The voice-over informs us, "Suddenly I notice the bird. It sits as stone on its eggs. The reapers area getting closer, their bright blades slicing low, I can do nothing" (11-12). As she speaks we see the bird, the approaching reapers, and the flashing blade that cuts into her. These initial allusions to *Upon Appleton House* are typical of the film's use of Marvell. They do not simply echo Marvell's imagery, but simultaneously recall the power of the Marvellian themes while radically transforming them. Thus the dead bird in *Upon Appleton House* leaves the mower with a sense of foreboding, carries with it a sense of fate and mortality, and is related to the imagery of the Israelites and the parting of the waters of the Red Sea. In *The Serpent's Kiss*, however, the images of the sweating reapers and the bloodied bird become symbols of adolescent female sexuality. This is made overt as the opening just described cuts to the second scene and we see Thea, the young woman whose voice we have heard, talking to her mother Juliana. Juliana refers to the opening scene as a dream, and suggestively says, "I thought ... perhaps ... the reaper ... was going to do something ... to you" (12). In answer, Thea says, "Sometimes--I'm the bird" (13).

The problem for a filmmaker alluding to Marvell in this way is that the portion of the film-going audience who will identify these images as deriving from *Upon Appleton House* is no doubt small. Viewers who do not recognize Marvell in the language of these opening scenes will certainly experience a visually effective opening with strong sexual implications, but there is an important dimension of the film that they will miss. This likely explains the film's mixed reception, with some reviewers liking the film while many others were bored by it. However, whatever the reason for audience likes and dislikes, no viewer will miss at least a general sense of Marvell's centrality to the film, for Price and Rousselot continually and explicitly draw the audience's attention to his poetry. Thus, after Thea reveals her identification with the bird, her mother rebukes her for reading too much, "Particularly Andrew Marvell's poetry" (13). Similarly, playing the coy mistress when she arrives late for dinner, Thea describes "Chrome" as a man with little time, as one who is always in a hurry, as her vegetable love, and as "a Marvell. A marvel" (32), which gives

[3] The edition cited is Andrew Marvell, *Selected Poetry*, ed Frank Kermode (New York: New American Library, 1967). This reading edition is used throughout since at one point I wished to refer to one of Kermode's notes.

Smithers occasion to explain to "Chrome" that Andrew Marvell was an English poet. The collection of Marvell's poetry carried by Thea in these scenes has already appeared in the film and is carried or read by either Thea or "Chrome" in many of the scenes that follow. Two lengthy quotations from Marvell are thus identified as his, even if the viewer is not familiar with the poems being quoted, because we can see that they derive from his collected works.

The use of these two quotations is interesting in that they mark turning points in the relationship between "Chrome" and Thea. The first of these occurs when Thea is angry over "Chrome's" destruction of the wilderness area that she loves. Believing that he comes from Holland, she tears into him through an angry recital of the opening lines of Marvell's "The Character of Holland":

> Holland, that scarce deserves the name of land,
> As but th'off-scouring of the British sand;
> And by so much earth as was contributed
> By English pilots when they heaved the lead;
> Or what by th' oceans slow alluvion fell,
> Of shipwrecked cockle and the mussel shell;
> This undigested vomit of the sea
> Fell to the Dutch by just propriety. (ll.1-8)

Thea's fierce, vitriolic tirade is so effective that one almost wonders if "Chrome" had been made Dutch to enable this stunning application of Marvell's satire against Holland.

The second of these extended references to a Marvell poem occurs just a few scenes later. As a part of the plan to bankrupt Thomas Smithers, "Chrome" forges a letter which purports to come from Larousse, his partner and mentor in garden design. "Chrome" has previously said that he believes that this man had perished on a plant collecting voyage to the new world, and now he will supposedly find out that he has miraculously escaped death at sea. We watch "Chrome" composing the letter with the book of Marvell's poetry open before him, and as he reads it we find that his description of this escape and landfall is taken directly from Marvell's "Bermudas." Thea, of course, recognizes the poem, and makes clear that she does so by incorporating phrases from the poem into her questions to "Chrome." "Through the watery maze," she asks. "An 'eternal spring'?" "The oranges are 'golden lamps in a green night.'" "Chrome" excitedly answers yes to each statement. His method of deceiving her father thus simultaneously becomes a way of revealing at least a part of the truth to Thea, and she acknowledges and keeps his secret.

Most of the many other allusions to Marvell are briefer and less overtly identified. A number of them are to "The Garden," "The Mower's Song,"and "Damon the Mower," the texts of which are appended to the published screenplay. These allusions tend to broadly evoke Marvellian imagery and themes rather than relying upon

detailed echoes of Marvellian language. One lengthy extract from "The Garden" appears early in the film:

> Mistaken long, I sought you then
> In busy companies of men.
> Your sacred plants, if here below,
> Only among the plants will grow
> Society is all but rude
> To this delicious solitude. (ll.11-16)[4]

Thea is reading aloud to herself (her voice becoming clearly audible with the second line of this passage) when "Chrome" first arrives at the estate and introduces himself. However, her book has not yet been identified as being by Marvell and thus, unlike the two quotations just discussed, this allusion is immediately apparent only to those who recognize "The Garden." What it clearly does, however, in the reference to solitude, society, and plants is to introduce major themes that the film will explore. In particular, "The Garden" criticizes the struggle for success:

> How vainly men themselves amaze
> To win the palm, the oak, or bays . . . . (ll.1-2)

The alternative to such "uncessant labors" is the quiet found in the "delicious solitude" of the passage that Thea is reading. Unlike the vision of Marvell's narrator, Smithers's garden is no retreat. House and garden are status symbols. Having no son to establish a dynasty, he desires a monument that will perpetuate his name. He wants it to make his mark upon the new century. Comparisons to Marvell's *Upon Appleton House* reflect the same irony. Marvell commends Fairfax's home because of its sobriety and because it does not contain the extravagant work of foreign architects. When he first meets "Chrome," Smithers boasts about the improvements he is making to the house, which are in the latest fashion. Moreover, in hiring "Chrome' he believes that he is hiring a prestigious *foreign* garden designer.

Many other passages from "The Garden" are wittily incorporated into the film. In one fascinating scene set in the midst of Thea's favorite piece of wilderness before she realizes that "Chrome's" formal garden will destroy it, Thea warns "Chrome" against her mother: "I can't do anything about your heart. . . . My mother has cut her name in it like the bark of a tree. Without thinking of the damage she does. Don't let her strip the bark right round. Or the tree will die" (53-4). Her warning echoes the complaint in about lovers in "The Garden":

[4]The passage cited (starting with the second line) is used in the film but is not specified in the screenplay, which only indicates that she is reading aloud (murmuring) to herself. I include the first line here for clarity.

> Fond lovers, cruel as their flame,
> Cut in these trees their mistress' name. (ll.9-20)

Similarly, "Chrome" is a "skillful gard'ner"(65), and his stripping off of his clothing earlier in this scene, when he believes himself to be alone, may recall Marvell's description of "that happy Garden-state" (57) prior to Eve's arrival. Thea, who displays a profound knowledge of plants in this scene, identifying them by name and discussing their properties, may remind us of T. C. in "The Picture of Little T. C. in a Prospect of Flowers," who in turn alludes to Eve:

> In the green grass she loves to lie,
> And there with her fair aspect tames
> The wilder flowers and gives them names. (ll.3-5)

As Frank Kermode notes, naming the flowers was a task traditionally assigned to Eve in Eden (93).

The mowers that appeared in the opening sequence reappear several times in the film and draw upon Marvell's mower poems as well as the scene from *Upon Appleton House*. For example, while sweat is a natural enough result of the hard work of reaping, one wonders if the sweating reapers of the opening scene may not owe a debt to "Damon the Mower," in which Damon refers to the sun drying his sweat:

> "I am the Mower Damon, known
> Through all the meadows I have mown.
> On me the morn her dew distills
> Before her darling daffodils:
> And, if at noon my toil me heat,
> The sun himself licks off my sweat . . . . (ll.41-46)

More clearly, the gardener Galmoy (Gerard McSorley) reflects the sentiments of the Mower in "The Mower Against Gardens." He shares the Mower's opposition to enclosing land and replacing "the sweet fields" with "the fountain and the grot" (30-31), which "Chrome" will include in his garden. Moreover, "The Mower Against Gardens" ends with a protest against replacing the fauns and fairies of the field with statues, and statues of the Roman gods figure prominently in Chrome's design. However, while the Mower merely protests the exclusion of Nature from the garden, Galmoy predicts catastrophic consequences for doing so.

The mother's name, Juliana, also clearly derives from Marvell's mower poems, where Juliana is the "cruel mistress" of Petrarchan poetry. The mower Damon longs for her, but his love is unrequited. His complaint in "The Mower's Song" is that "Juliana comes, and she / What I do to the grass, does to my thoughts and me." That is to say, she cuts him down, and Marvell's coterie audience no doubt found it

humorous to find these lover's conceits placed in the mouth of a humble mower. However, the film's Juliana is no Petrarchan mistress, though she is an object of desire. We are told that she is one of her husband's two weaknesses (the other being his vanity), and her cousin Fitzmaurice longs for her. She finds herself attracted to "Chrome," but he is truly attracted not to her, but to Thea. There is no real analogue to Damon in these intertwining loves, but near the end of the film, Thea refers to Damon when telling her mother that her "Meneer Chrome" is preparing to leave. The reference springs from her jealousy, for she still believes that "Chrome" is attracted to her mother rather than to her.

Thea's final escape from her father's house is also strongly indebted to Marvell. We learn early in the film that Smithers's estate had originally been owned by Catholics, and Smithers's is so proud of being broad-minded that when he decides that Thea needs medical help for her mental state, he is willing to have his daughter treated by a doctor from a nearby Catholic hospital. Nuns closely watch over her once her treatment begins, a detail that has its roots in *Upon Appleton House*. Isabella Thwaites had been left in the care of the Prioress of Nun Appleton, who tried to prevent her marriage to Sir William Fairfax, and Fairfax dramatically rescued his bride-to-be from the convent by force. "Chrome" and Thea similarly escape in his carriage.

Even before her escape, however, Thea's force has been opposed to the force of the house and garden. When her mother, at the beginning of the film, berated her for reading too much Andrew Marvell, she said "You see connections that aren't there, and you turn his words into predictions. As though he wrote them just for you" (13). This mystic affinity between Thea and Marvell culminates in an amazing scene. Smithers's garden has been completed, and he has invited friends and neighbors to a celebration. He has provided the ironwork for the garden from his own foundry, including a huge wrought iron gate. Thea picks the white puffball of a dandelion that has gone to seed and begins to blow on it while casting a spell with lines from "To His Coy Mistress":

> Let us roll all our strength, and all
> Our sweetness, up into one ball:
> And tear our pleasures with rough strife
> Thorough the iron gates of life.
> Thus, though we cannot make our sun
> Stand still, yet we will make him run. (ll.41-46)

As she blows steadily on her dandelion, a mighty wind roars through her father's iron gates, destroying the garden. Chaos and nature thus triumph over the desire for order signified by the garden.

Stealing Marvell's Poetry: Self-Actualization in *The Serpent's Kiss*

Karen Zagrodnik
South Dakota State University

The opening scene of director Philippe Rousselot's *The Serpent's Kiss* presents an image which appears "shimmering, unfocused" and a voice-over by a young woman: "I'm standing on the shore of a green sea. There's a buzzing in my head. I can't focus. I'm wearing a white dress. I feel I want to dive in and swim until I drown."[1] In these opening lines, Anne, the daughter of Juliana and Thomas Smithers, attempts to convey the confinement of her life. She initiates and completes the film's narrative, for the final scene depicts her on a beach, beside a sea of green, wearing a white dress. Between these two scenes Anne is a character blocked by social and cultural constraints which deny her the self-actualization she envisions for herself. Although the film incorporates visual devices (specific camera shots, props, settings, and costumes) to establish and underscore the constraints imposed on Anne, the script allows her to employ language, and specifically the poetry of Andrew Marvell, as a force that allows Anne/Thea to speak herself into being.

These opening scenes present actual and imagined violence, which underscore Anne's social and psychological confinements. The action on the screen shifts from the sea to a line of reapers mowing waist-high grass; a camera shot then reveals a bird sitting on her nest. The scene moves from the reapers to Anne standing beside a dark paneled wall in her mother's bed chamber, looking out a window. Dying in the sea offers Anne an escape from the estate house, whose solidity contrasts with the fluidity of the sea in the opening scene. Relegated to a life in a manor house which represents her parents' new social status, she feels her life is threatened daily: the bird in the opening scene caught in the meadow grasses and killed by the scythe symbolizes Anne's own existence. The very place that should afford her protection, her parents' house, slowly destroys her. Coupled with this first containment is the threat of sexual violence. The bird sits atop her eggs, immobilized by fear but protecting her

[1] Quotes from the film are taken from Tim Rose Price's published screenplay (London: Orion Media, 1998). This screenplay includes several of Marvell's poems, including "The Garden," "The Mower's Song," and "Damon the Mower," but does not include the most often quoted poem "To his Coy Mistress."

offspring rather than escape her imminent death. As the reaper's blade flashes, he looks out of the scene and into Anne's eyes; this contact suggests that, like the bird restrained by her maternal obligation and the confines of the nest, so might Anne's future roles as wife and mother, as pre-determined by her sex and social status, limit the possibilities of her life.[2] The reaper's blade and the splashing blood allude to the breaking of the hymen, underscored by the setting of the mother's bed chamber, with the marriage bed prominently placed in the background and her mother putting on make-up (including a beauty mark) and a red dress. Although no one, especially no men, visit, Juliana feels compelled to fulfill her feminine obligations as sexualized object. The sexual act brings with it terror and possible destruction, and Anne's response "Sometimes--I am the bird" to her mother's question, "Is it a dream?" imply a fear of her own emerging sexual identity.

The act of changing her name initiates the process of self-actualization and escape, if only a symbolic one. When her mother tells her, "You read too much, Annie. You must rest your mind. It becomes overheated," Anne counters, "I'm not Annie--I'm Thea," indicating her resistance to her parents' authority. She constructs herself as a female figure with power and authority. Indeed, the name refers to the Titaness who was the mother of Helios (the Sun), Selene (the Moon), and Eos (the Dawn).[3] In selecting this name, Thea positions herself as one who also gives birth to a powerful being--herself. The doubled name suggests a dual identity: while Anne might be controlled by her parents, Thea refuses to be limited by such authorities, for the suggestion of the heavenly bodies removes her from their earthly limitations. The introduction of these heavenly bodies alludes to the numerous references of time in Marvell's poems "To his Coy Mistress," "Damon the Mower," and "The Mower's Song," including lines such as "Had we but world enough, and time" ("To his Coy Mistress" l. 1). As Thea, Anne claims an identity who challenges time, language, and conventions.

Juliana warns her daughter not to read too much, for Marvell's poetry "overheats" the mind, suggesting that the actual poems lead to mental imbalance, particularly in

[2]Lawrence Stone notes the "practical benefit to be gained by parents from the extraordinary measure taken to break the child's will at an early age was that later on he [sic] would accept with passive resignation their decisions in the two most important choices of his [sic] life, that of an occupation, and that of a marriage partner (*The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* [New York: Harper & Row, 1977], 178-9). Such absolute authority was most often exercised by aristocratic families, but Smithers's social aspirations lead him to mimic this practice.

[3]In his *Dictionary of Classical Mythology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), J. E. Zimmerman traces Thea's lineage and notes that her "attribute was light" (262). Zimmerman's entry relates the story of Thea, the daughter of the centaur Chiron who is ravished by Aeolus and is then changed into a mare before giving birth to a foal. This story of sexual initiation and perversion adds another layer of meaning to Thea's identity as it is possible that Chrome becomes her husband or at the very least her lover. Grimal lists an alternative spelling of the name: "Theia" (Pierre Grimal, *The Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, trans. A. R. Maxwell-Hyslop [New York: Blackwell, 1986]). The Oxford English Dictionary also notes that "thea" is a genus of the tea plants found in China and Japan, an allusion to the garden which will be built on the estate and the exotic plantings rather than the native plants which will soon fill the grounds surrounding the house.

young women. Juliana, as an experienced woman, recognizes the sexual references within the work and her comment suggests that such topics are not appropriate for young, unmarried girls. Yet, Thea's only available escape takes the form of reading. Physically, she is confined to her father's estate and the surrounding wilderness. The distance between Smithers's estate and homes or towns must be enough to discourage frequent visitors. She has neither tutor nor female companion. Prompted by Marvell's writings, she envisions exotic places, such as the sea (inspired, perhaps, by Marvell's poem "Bermuda"). Poetry facilitates Thea's self-actualization.

Coupled with her isolated existence and the limitations imposed on the type of knowledge she can possess, Thea represents her mother's failure to produce a male heir and her parent's disappointment in her sex. Juliana's barrenness prompts Smithers to seek some other means to establish his legacy. Explaining his plans to Chrome, the imposter gardener who has been blackmailed into posing as a great Dutch landscaper's assistant, Smithers says, "I have no son. But I intend to leave something behind with my name on it. You have my wife as your inspiration--that should be enough for any man!" Smithers' progeny will be his estate, his house and the realized gardens showcasing a combination of artistry, horticulture, and human mastery over nature, and his barren wife's beauty will prompt plans which result in a fertile space. This technique of a male speaker who seeks the assistance of another male to help him control the wilderness and do so with the aid of a sexual and sexualized woman imitates "the heterosexual, reproductive world introduced in so many of Marvell's poems with the male speaker."[4] Thea is aware of her parent's disappointment in her sex, and while they do not reject her outright, her situation as a daughter who will not continue the family's name represents another constraint.[5]

For the first dinner after Chrome arrives at the estate, Thea enters the room after the rest of the family is seated, the ever-present Marvell volume in hand. She resembles her mother, for she wears a heavy gown and make-up with her hair arranged in an elaborate style. We are meant to recognize this as a performance, that Thea is merely acting the role of a young woman ready for courtship and marriage. To heighten the performance, Thea mimics her mother's gestures and speech. This is not the self Thea seeks, and she is not a young woman intent on a marriage of class or money. Thea uses the moment to demonstrate that the expectation she fulfill these

[4]Sarah Monette, "Speaking and Silent Women in 'Upon Appleton House,'" *SEL* 42:1 ( ), 162.

[5]Neither this scene nor the film indicates whether or not Smithers considers bequeathing his estate to his daughter. In his study on inheritance and settlement practices of "great landowners," J. P. Cooper states that "the view that descent of land among great landowners by male primogeniture . . . was a distinctive feature of western society" ("Patterns of Inheritance and Settlement by Great Landowners from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries," *Family and Inheritance: Rural Society in Western Europe 1200-1800*, Jack Goody, Joan Thirsk, and E. P. Thompson, eds. [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976], 192). He also notes that "marriage settlements from the later sixteenth century frequently made provision for daughters," and these settlements could and did include both money and land. Smithers, as part of the rising middle class of merchants, would be under different social and legal constraints when it came to his property; however, his obsession with building the gardens as his legacy suggests, at least at this time, he does not anticipate her inheriting his home and estates.

roles is itself an artifice. Language serves as a vehicle for gaining power. Throughout the film, many of Thea's lines are direct quotes or paraphrases of Marvell's poetry, and in this scene, she speaks to Chrome through "To his Coy Mistress," suggesting that he is always in a hurry. Looking at Chrome, she exclaims, "My vegetable love," and then, punning on the poet's name, tells Chrome "Oh but you're a Marvell. A marvel." Through Marvell's poetry, Thea can express thoughts and feelings that as a modest young woman, an ideal marriage prospect, she would not be permitted to say or feel. Her dress and behavior contrasted with her speech reflect her struggle to conform to her parents' expectations. At the end of the scene, Thea turns over the roast bird laid on the silver platter (a reference to the female bird killed at the beginning of the film and suggesting that young women are trussed up in a similar manner when given away in marriage), and exclaims, "It's so undignified--lying on your back with your legs spread out." Thea's reference to the sexual act, and the woman's subservient position, shocks because it reveals she has been acting the role of the modest young woman. Even more importantly, in a scene in which she quotes a poem relating male narrator's attempts to seduce a woman, Thea steals the language and power of the male, rendering him impotent both sexually and linguistically. While Smithers curses Marvell, blaming the poet for his daughter's transgressive behavior, Thea owns the poem's words and uses them as a means of defying and challenging the social and sexual conventions which constrain her. Unlike Thwaites in *Marvell's Upon Appleton House* who establishes her subjectivity only through her tears and is still relegated to the role of the virginal betrothed (Monette 161), Thea begins to establish her autonomy through language as she challenges and upsets the patriarchal order and the masculinity of Marvell's poetry, language, and speakers.

It is this very language which prompts Smithers to order a physician to begin a course of treatment for what he perceives as Anne/Thea's madness. The physician employs a variety of treatments, from leeches to sedative potions. The scenes in which the various curative measures take place visually underscore the physician's efforts to regulate Thea's behavior and control her mind, returning her to a more balanced state. Walls frame some of these shots, intensifying the feeling of restraint. Other times, viewers see past a door into the treatment room, limiting what can be seen behind this barrier. In one particularly disturbing scene, Thea is seated on a bench, two nuns on either side of her. They sit on her hands, the sleeves of her white dress disappearing under their black habits, in an effort to prevent her from moving or escaping. As the camera tilts up on the scene, revealing more of Thea, the viewer realizes wears a black buckled hood, completely obliterating her face. None of the distinguishing physical attributes that would identify her as Anne/Thea can be seen, and we know who the character is only because she has been constructed as the patient. In an additional effort to control her, one of the nuns reads from the Bible; Marvell's influence and language, like Thea's speech, have been silenced by the words of God. Such methods, for a time, subdue Thea, but it is clear it is only

because she has also been drugged and submission prevents more extreme cures.

As he builds the garden, Chrome has many opportunities to observe Thea, but physical barriers are always present in their encounters. The first time Chrome meets Thea, as his carriage drives up to the house, she sits on the steps reading. However, these steps take on the appearance of a brick wall, as if separating her from the wildness behind her. Later, Chrome spies on Thea through a knot hole in the floor of his room, which happens to be above Thea's bedroom. He observes her being placed in bed after one of her treatments; then the bed curtains obscure her from him. Another time Chrome finds Thea in a walled garden apart from the one he is constructing; she reads from the Marvell book under the watchful gaze of the nuns and the physician. Towards the end of the narrative, Chrome discovers Thea near the woad sheds constructed of rickety wooden posts and slatted roofs. Although the sheds are open on all sides, the hanging balls of woad that are drying act as walls and barriers, so that Chrome has to push his way through the woad to reach Thea. These visual devices emphasize the distance between Chrome and Thea, first because they are strangers, but later because of their ideological differences regarding the nature of gardens. As Chrome reveals the truth about himself to Thea and as she recognizes his love for her, these barriers no longer appear in the scenes. In fact, as Thea moves away from the woad sheds and Chrome follows, he moves through the hanging balls and finally out into the field where the only obstructions are the flowers and grasses which are far easier to move than stone walls and wooden floors.

Although she may be at the mercy of the physician and her parents, and while there are physical barriers that act against her, Thea has the power to impose constraints on others. The other characters recognize when Thea moves from her own language and the words and lines of specific poems, but these characters are incapable of understanding the poems and the ideas Thea expresses through the quotations. What others believe to be madness actually is Thea's efforts to articulate her identity through a language that captures her experiences, thoughts, and feelings. In this way, Thea suggests the type of woman introduced in Claudine Herrmann's *The Tongue Snatchers*. Herrmann's translator Nancy Kline refers to Cixous's notion that a woman who writes "is a revolutionary, a robber, . . . taking the masculine discourse that surrounds her . . . , possessing it in what is quite explicitly a sexual act, only to rise from the kiss . . . into flight and further thievery."[6] Herrmann argues that women who are written by men and who are denied access to their own selves will go insane (69) and "the woman who dares to speak must . . . consider herself insane . . ." (70). When women writers, and in this film, women speakers claim language and release it from the "time/space" under which it is constructed they are able to disrupt the (masculine) order which attempts to control them by imposing "a language that is not her own, a language of men, by definition alienating" (23). Thea, who has marginalized herself by her use of Marvell's language and who is punished for it by

[6] Claudine Herrmann, *The Tongue Snatchers*, trans. Nancy Kline (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1989), viii.

further marginalization imposed by others, finally gains power when she speaks her identity into being as she rejects the garden constructed by Chrome and turns instead to the wilderness beyond the garden's walls and gates.

At their first meeting, Thea indicates that there is a "garden in here (the Marvell volume)! It is my favourite poem. But sometimes I prefer the fields." Later, when she seeks solitude and an escape from the house, she goes to a small stream in the fields. Chrome tells her that the field, her sanctuary, will be destroyed in order to make space for the formal garden. Thea distinguishes between her parents' space (their formal garden) and her space (the fields). In doing so, Thea not only distances herself from her parents and their plans to control nature but she articulates her own desires and identity. She is like the field that cannot be controlled, for even when the grasses are cut down they return again and again. Later, in the walled garden, aware now of the extent to which Chrome has violated her field in order to fulfill Smithers's plans, she rails at him, saying, "*Holland*, that scarce deserves the name of Land,/ As but th' Off-scouring of the British Sand./ This indigested vomit of the Sea/ Fell to the Dutch by just Propriety."[7] As the garden nears completion, Thea comes out to wander through the space. When Chrome shows her a fountain he has constructed for her, flowing with water colored blue by the woad, Thea rejects it and him, indicated that the artificial spring could never replace the one in the field which he has destroyed. Before he begins the garden, Thea warned Chrome that her mother "has cut her name in [Chrome's heart] like the bark of a tree. Without thinking of the damage she does. Don't let her strip the bark right round. Or the tree will die." In much the same manner, the creation of the formal garden has damaged her. Thea recognizes the garden for what it is: a "disposition of space" (Herrmann 114), of her space, by two men.

For the culminating moment of her power of and over language, at the party to introduce the gardens to the public, Thea appears dressed again in imitation of her mother. As she rakes the gravel in the walkway that leads to the iron gates Smithers had built at his own foundry, Chrome observes her and prevents the physician from restraining her. Finally, Chrome acknowledges that her behavior is not abnormal; instead, the desire to control nature is what is unnatural. Thea rakes away the straight and orderly lines, breaking the regimented form of the garden. She steps through the gates, picks up a dandelion, blows upon the seeds which are carried away on a growing wind, and then walks towards the distant wilderness as a violent storm destroys the garden, driving all but Chrome indoors. The dandelion, a weed that would be removed from a formal garden, represents the wild, uncontrolled field. Thea's recitation of the final lines from "To his Coy Mistress" sounds like an

[7]These lines are from "The Character of Holland" (1-2 and 7-8). In his essays "Sirens Without a Song," D. Christopher Gabbard explores the politicized gendering of Holland's females, noting that women performed tasks often associated with "'men's work'" ("Sirens Without a Song: Gender Stereotyping in Marvell's 'The Character of Holland,'" *English Language Notes* Sept. 2002: 62). As she directs these lines at Chrome, Thea indicates she suspects he is not Dutch, once again employing Marvell's language to express her own thoughts and feelings.

incantation of a spell:

> Let us roll all our strength and all
> Our sweetness up into one ball,
> And tear our pleasures with rough strife
> Through the iron gates of life:
> Thus, though we cannot make our sun
> Stand still, yet we will make him run. (ll. 41-46)

The lines are, in part, an invitation to Chrome to join her, uniting their strength in order to gain power over all that contains them, including the sun. They are a simultaneous validation and condemnation, for she, unlike him, has found the strength to seek that which validates her, even if the price is further confinement (and, indeed, the next day the physician treats Thea once again for an imbalanced mind and urges her father to commit her to an asylum). She speaks her power and then acts on it as she opens the iron gates that attempt to keep the wilderness at bay. The winds that follow stop the physician from reaching her; finally, if only for a short time, she has power to prevent him from treating her. And the storm which destroys the garden restores the wilderness. Thea has broken free from the confinements, empowered by Marvell's language as she controls the "colonized body of knowledge and an adulterated language" (Herrmann 7) in order to turn this language back on the sexual, patriarchal, and symbolic orders, disrupting them.[8]

As Chrome leaves the Smithers estate, Thea runs after the carriage and leaves with him. She has finally broken free of the house, her parents, the garden, and the physician. Although in this scene she is dressed in her mother's clothing and wears her wig in this scene of flight, in the next scene, set at the seaside, she wears a white petticoat, her hair unadorned and loose. Rousselot incorporates wide shots throughout these ending scenes, with the expansive sea, beach, and sky filling the shots; the camera views emphasize the sense of freedom and openness afforded by this change in setting. Seated in the sand, Thea reads from a book, her Marvell, and Chrome's head rests in her lap; the sexual violations hinted at throughout the film and the poems no longer have power over Thea. In a swift but sure gesture, Thea stands and then throws the volume into the sky where it changes into a white sea bird. She

[8]In fact, this scene is the one that changes most readings of Marvell's poems about gardens and nature, such as "The Mower against Gardens." The destroyed garden and the opened gate offer a different view of those gardens which are often political spaces and politicized to be read as "the enclosed garden of England and the enclosed garden of the chaste but generative wife" which explore the nature of the "proper 'husbandman' for the country" (Cristina Malcolmson, "The Garden Enclosed/The Woman Enclosed: Marvell and the Cavalier Poets" in Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern England, Richard Burt and John Michael Archer, eds. [Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994], 252). The objectified woman leaves the garden and the men, unable to restore order, also abandon it, paralleling the destruction of Nunappleton gardens when Maria marries and leaves her father's house.

has reached her sea, and the gesture suggests she no longer needs Marvell's poetry to speak for her. Instead, she will speak her own words. As she stands facing the fishermen and their net removed further down the beach, a doubling of the mowers and their scythes at the beginning of the film, Thea's gesture of abandon as she throws up her arm indicates that this final constraint, the nightmare which opened the film, has been purged. If we accept the definition of pastoral as "a mode, literally as a way of interpreting experience, a measure of ordering that experience and giving it conspicuous artistic form," we could indeed call this film a pastoral as it presents Anne/Thea's process of using language to order her experiences and reveals the ways in which she slowly gains power and autonomy.[9]

[9] Donald M. Friedman, *Marvell's Pastoral Art* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1970), 7.

"I thought perhaps the reaper was going to do something to you": *The Serpent's Kiss* and the Issue of Reverse-Objectification

Jason McEntee
South Dakota State University

In this discussion, I examine the continual problem of female representation in the movie narrative. Movie narratives often rely on female characters situated in roles that find them objectified by males, allowing us to hypothesize--as the body of feminist film criticism has done since at least the mid-1970s--that she also becomes objectified by her viewing audience. In calling for a sweeping change in the mindsets of both male and female filmmakers, Sharon Smith precisely points out the problems of female representation:

> The role of the woman in a film almost always revolves around her physical attraction and the mating games she plays with the male characters. On the other hand a man is not shown purely in relation to the female characters, but in a wide variety of roles--struggling against nature..., or against militarism..., or proving his manhood on the range. Women provide trouble or sexual interludes for the male characters, or are not present at all.[1]

I will use Smith's observation as a springboard into a brief examination of female representation in *The Piano*.[2] Using this movie as a guide, I will then demonstrate how The Serpent's Kiss, much as *The Piano* does, provides us with a model of female empowerment--a model that subverts the patriarchal order of the movie narrative.[3]

As my colleagues, Bruce Brandt and Karen Zagrodnik have pointed out, *The*

[1] Sharon Smith, "The Image of Women in Film: Some Suggestions for Future Research" in *Feminist Film Theory: A Reader*. ed. Sue Thornham (New York: NYUP, 1999), 14.

[2] *The Piano*, dir. Jane Campion, Miramax Films, 1992.

[3] *The Serpent's Kiss*, dir. Philippe Rousselot, Berryer Films, 1997.

Serpent's Kiss follows the actions of garden architect Meneer Chrome (Ewan McGregor) as he struggles to design a garden for Thomas (Pete Postlethwaite) and Juliana (Greta Scacchi). Chrome is the pawn of Juliana's cousin Fitzmaurice (Richard E. Grant), who has come to the estate to bring ruin to Thomas and force Juliana to rekindle a love they shared when they were young. Fitzmaurice plans to use Chrome to bait Thomas into purchasing the most elaborate garden possible, and in the process, Thomas will ruin himself financially and force Juliana into his arms. Chrome influences all of the characters, but he most directly affects the life of their daughter, Anna (Carmen Chaplin), who has changed her name to Thea. Compelled by the Marvell poetry she continually reads and cites, Anna/Thea has grown quite fond of the wild foliage that grows upon the ground where the garden will be established--she prefers the chaos and disorder of the wild growth as opposed to the structured order of the new garden. In addition, Chrome's actions allow us to see Juliana as symbolically castrated (she is revealed to be barren), and she in effect reminds us that the threat of symbolic castration--and a removal of female empowerment--poses a problem for Anna/Thea.

What I find compelling is that Anna/Thea directly avoids her mother's plight through her struggle for feminine autonomy despite the patriarchal order of the home. Upon completion of the garden, Anna/Thea defies her symbolic castration (for we are to believe she has drawn her power from the wild flora) and returns even stronger. As I discuss momentarily, she becomes the resurrected destructive force when she "destroys" the finished garden by channeling the winds and bringing ruin to Chrome's design.

Similar themes exist in Jane Campion's *The Piano*. Protagonist Ada (Holly Hunter), a mute woman who plays her piano to convey her feelings, provides for us a glaring symbol of how female castration is represented in mainstream cinema, and the threat of castration is placed on her daughter Flora (Anna Paquin) to recognize that she too can fall victim to this. Ada arrives in colonial-era New Zealand as a product of an arranged marriage to Alisdair (Sam Neill). Their marriage is loveless and sterile--she defies his sexual advances and he, in turn, is unable to display love and affection for his new bride. The natives refer to Alisdair as "old dry balls," and in a cruel act, he sells Ada's beloved piano to Baines (Harvey Keitel). Baines, who begins to fall in love with Ada, works out an exchange with Alisdair--an exchange that will have Ada come to his home and teach him how to play. He begins to "sell" her piano back to her, key by key, in return for sexual favors. They eventually fall in love against these improbable circumstances, and upon finding out, the enraged Alisdair chops off Ada's finger with an axe.

When Alisdair cuts off Ada's finger, we see an example of what feminist film criticism suggests is a symbolic castration scene. Alisdair forces Ada's daughter, Flora, to deliver the finger/penis to Baines in a symbolic transfer of masculine power: Alisdair has "castrated" the autonomous Ada (autonomy, of course, is a trait that movies often reserve for the male protagonist), and in so doing, he strips her of her

power and attempts to take her back from Baines. Baines must receive the finger because he has, in effect, shown her how to attain her autonomy by helping her realize that love can never be forced. Flora, as the instrument of delivery--the instrument that conveys the transfer of power--allows us to see how the child plays a role in developing a narrative's power structures. (Flora, as we see in the movie, betrays her mother by taking a piano key inscribed with a love message not to Baines, as Ada intends, but to Alisdair.) By movie's end, despite Alisdair telling Ada that "I clipped your wing, that's all," Baines and Ada move to England, where he has procured for her a prosthetic finger.

The colonization of New Zealand, which serves as a backdrop of the colonization of women, allows us to imagine that the female character is often "colonized" within the movie narrative. Flora, like Anna/Thea does in*Kiss*, serves as a means to assess the plight of the mother. Like *Kiss*, the natural landscapes of the movie serve as a means to gauge the psychology of the narrative. We see that Flora "peeks" through holes and witnesses the primal scene between Ada and Baines. The first scene of Alisdair's cabin reveals a home on a barren, scorched landscape, and we see that in traveling to the cabin, they have to walk through muck and mud into the prison of his settlement. Later, when he first discovers Ada's affair with Baines, he literally traps her in the cabin. Ada's struggles throughout the movie suggest that the emancipation from the patriarchal order for the female protagonist is a journey fraught with horror.

Using feminist film criticism allows us to effectively access the plight of the female in the movie narrative. In Laura Mulvey's landmark essay "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" allows us to gauge how the female character

> connotes something that the look [the masculine gaze both within the film and imparted by the viewers] continually circles around but disavows: her lack of a penis, implying a threat of castration and hence unpleasure. Ultimately, the meaning of woman is sexual difference, the visually ascertainable absence of a penis, the material evidence on which is based the castration complex essential for the organization of entrance to the symbolic order and the law of the father. Thus the woman as icon, displayed for the gaze and enjoyment of men, the active controllers of the look, always threaten to evoke the anxiety it originally signified.[4]

She suggests three possible solutions to this: 1) "investigating the woman, demystifying her mystery"; 2) the "devaluation, punishment or saving of the guilty object"; and 3) "complete disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object or turning the represented figure itself into a fetish so that it becomes reassuring

---

[4]Laura Mulvey, *Visual and Other Pleasures* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 21.

rather than dangerous" (21).[5]

The Piano's narrative works to "investigate the woman" and, by movie's end, we see her "devaluation, punishment, [and] saving" as well as her reconstitution not as a "dangerous" woman but as an autonomous subject who realizes her love for Baines. In addition, we see similar actions at work in *Kiss,* where Anna/Thea has a dream about a reaper who has killed a bird. Anna/Thea has dreamed of this bird, and when, in reality, the reaper does kill the bird with his scythe (in an image that suggests the male is the castrator of the female), he then eats one of its eggs raw in front of her. We see a symbolic representation of a fate that she will share with her barren mother--she will become suppressed by the patriarchal order. Her mother, after hearing about her dream, tells her: "I thought perhaps the reaper was going to do something to you." Anna/Thea replies: "Sometimes I'm the bird."

We have a clue that Anna/Thea will suffer the same fate as her mother when later, upon looking upon an image of her younger self, Juliana comments that she looks like Anna/Thea. Chrome senses this, too, and in looking upon the potential garden, comments, while glancing at Thea: "I wonder if I should ever get used to the unevenness of this country." Thomas tells him: "Chaos awaits you...Can you create order?" Thomas's existing grounds-crew tells them both that the wild land should be left untouched, and in this notion, we sense that breaking the ground for the garden will create chaos rather than order. Chrome defies this notion, however, and declares his allegiance to the patriarchal order of the home: "I am set designer for every human drama...The garden reflects glory and prestige and power upon its owner." Thomas tells him, in further establishing the father's order: "I have no son. But I intend to leave something behind with my name on it. You have my wife as your inspiration--that should be enough for any man!"[6]

Whereas *The Piano*'s Flora serves as an instrument leading to her mother's symbolic castration, Anna/Thea--whose barren mother is already symbolically castrated--seems to have the over to control whether or not she will fall victim to the patriarchal order. While dining one evening, Thomas nearly cuts off several of Anna/Thea's fingers while he is carving the bird they will eat. Yet she avoids the

[5]We might also consider another key figure in feminist film criticism in order to make our segue from *The Piano* to *The Serpent's Kiss*. Teresa de Lauretis, in "Oedipus Interruptus," writes that "If narrative is governed by an Oedipal logic, it is because it is situated within the system of exchange instituted by the incest prohibition, where woman functions as both a sign (representation) and a value (object) for that exchange. And if we remark ...that the woman as Mother (matter and matrix, body and womb) is the primary measure of value, 'an equivalent more universal than money,' then indeed we can see why the narrative image on which the film, any film, can be represented, sold, and bought is finally the woman.... In cinema as well, then, woman properly represents the fulfillment of the narrative promise (made, as we know, to the little boy), and that representation works to support the male status of the mythical subject (in Thornham, ed., *Feminist Film Theory*, 88). de Lauretis suggests, too, that the "female position" is the "figure of narrative closure."

[6]Later, in reinforcing the movie's establishing a male-dominated order, Chrome tells Anna/Thea--who is challenging his creation of the garden--that his father and his family were ruined by a great sea storm: "Nature is my enemy. It must be controlled."

danger posed by this symbolic castration while she also thwarts the ramifications posed through the vision of the reaper destroying the bird. She proceeds to flip the bird on its back, drawing attention to its asexual position and reminding those at the table--and those of us in the audience--that she could very well share that bird's fate. She flees the room, and Thomas declares: "She's not a child. She must be made to behave like a young lady! . . . I believe it's you [Juliana] indulging her that does the greatest damage of all."

The "serpent's kiss" symbol--a snake with its tail in its mouth--that Chrome places in the garden serves as an interesting reminder that the movie is occupied with a perpetual cycle of castration. Castration plays a large role in how we envision the actions of both Juliana and Anna/Thea as well as the actions of Chrome and Thomas. Kaja Silverman, in working with Mulvey's work, writes that "cinema's male viewer finds the vision of woman's lack threatening to his own coherence... [and that through fetishizing the female as on object of desire] an item of clothing or another part of the female anatomy becomes the locus of compensatory investment, and substitutes for the organ which is assumed to be missing."[7] Silverman writes that feminist film theory has focused on the "woman-as-lack": "the coding of the female subject as inadequate or castrated within dominant cinema" and that in addition to the focusing on a physical object, viewers are also able to see a shift to her "inside": a revelation that the woman has "either committed a crime for which she has to be punished, or suffered from a crippling illness. Since in either case woman's castration can be traced back to her own interiority, this resolution of the male viewer's anxiety permits him to place a maximum distance between himself and the spectacle of lack--or indulge in an attitude of 'triumphant contempt' for the 'mutilated creature' who is his sexual other" (101-2).

Anna takes the role of the Other--Thea--an act that in itself promotes a feminist reading of her character. Elizabeth Cowie writes that the woman's identity can be seen in two ways: 1) as a "socially defined" identity that she recognizes as "other" and thus resists; and 2) as a "social agent and psychical subject [that] is also a divided subject . . . in that splitting which arises when the subject identifies with its image as other, taking that image as its own. As a result our image of ourselves always comes to us from outside ourselves, from the place of the other. The story of our identities is the negotiation of this otherness of ourselves."[8] Anna/Thea struggles with this in the most obvious sense, but Juliana--as symbolically castrated feminine other--sees in her potential reawakening a chance to regain her sexual potency and recognize the role patriarchal society demands of her: the bearer of presumably masculine children--a role she has not fulfilled. In fact, it is Anna/Thea who has subverted this order

[7]Kaja Silverman, "Lost Objects and Mistaken Subjects" in Thornham, 101.

[8]Elizabeth Cowie, *Representing the Woman: Cinema and Psychanalysis* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 3.

because she avoids symbolic castration and emerges as the movie's most glaring symbol of power.

Through various interactions with Anna/Thea, Chrome begins to realize that he is falling in love with her--largely because her fierce independence and her love of nature have captivated him. Before the crew will destroy the wilderness that sits on the grounds where the garden will exist, Chrome tells Thomas that he is concerned about the destruction of the garden and its "consequence" on Anna/Thea. Yet Thomas rebukes him, and stays focused on the father's order. Thomas tells Chrome: "The fever is nourished by that chaotic place; it breeds distortion. An ordered, planned, patterned garden--governed by reason--with the reassuring works of man in evidence all around it." The wilderness is destroyed, and the garden completed. Chrome, however, keeps a small patch of "wilderness" in the garden for Anna/Thea, and upon seeing it, she declares: "It's far too well-behaved for me!"

The narrative of *The Serpent's Kiss* relies on the tensions between the mother/daughter relationship, and how this relationship can illustrate the plight of the female who tries to shake off the constraints of the patriarchy. Juliana, who senses that Chrome and Anna/Thea are experiencing feelings for each other, begins to wonder if Chrome--whose role as a gardener is not the most subtle symbol--can help her both eliminate her barrenness and regenerate passion in her life, for her marriage to Thomas is constructed as loveless and routine. It is Chrome, ironically, who suggests that Thomas include a "hothouse" in the garden. The hothouse will contain numerous exotic plants. Juliana welcomes the idea, and she watches as Chrome troubleshoots he building for drafts. He tells her that the hothouse space "must be controlled very precisely...an awakening...a resurrection" will take place when the seeds arrive and are allowed to germinate in their new home. Juliana, too, wants the hothouse (and Chrome) to serve as a means for her "awakening." She tells Chrome that she needs an "expert's touch." Although Juliana and Chrome never physically act upon the sexual energy in the hothouse because Chrome is too infatuated with Anna/Thea, their time together allows us to see how the constrained female can attempt to manipulate the masculine order so that she might break free of its rigid boundaries. It is shortly after this hothouse scene that Anna/Thea brings on the storm that destroys the garden and the hothouse, demonstrating that, like her mother, she wishes to break free of the patriarchy and experience a sense of autonomy.

Because both women attempt to manipulate Chrome to achieve their own goals (Anna/Thea wishes to return to the "wild"; Juliana wishes to reconstitute the passion of her marriage), Chrome becomes symbolic of what I call reverse-objectification. (As I mentioned earlier, he is also the instrument that Fitzmaurice uses to enact his scheme.) This process ultimately forces him to confess the scheme and escape. He and Anna/Thea end up at the sea, while Thomas and Juliana rekindle their relationship. They sit and stare at the ruined garden, and Thomas declares: "We'll all have to learn to do without. We must start again."

Juliana, through her travails, curiously has thwarted the potential for Anna/Thea's

to be completely objectified by the patriarchy. Anna/Thea does indeed represent a subjective presence, finally freed from the clutches of the patriarchy when her father realizes she is a person and sends away the cruel physician he has hired to cure her of her "ill humors." The narrative reveals an objectification of Chrome--he is the object of both Anna/Thea (who *takes him with her* to the sea) and Juliana as well as Thomas and FitzMaurice. By the end of the narrative, we see in the image of Juliana and Thomas speaking of "starting again" that Juliana, too, has regained her own subjectivity because Thomas no longer recognizes her as only a procreator, but as a life partner.

It is interesting to note, finally, that as feminist film theory continues to fill in the gaps of a lost female history by moving from subject-position and psychoanalytic theories into the realm of assessing the female's power not as sexual equal but as an equal earner (equal to the male in the realm of capitalism), Juliana and Thomas end up nearly ruined, equals in that regard as well. Their new start suggests that they, like Anna/Thea and Chrome at the sea, will begin their new lives on equal ground. But yet there is the grim specter that, as Mulvey writes in her "Afterthoughts on 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,'" there still exists a problem in narrative cinema, whereupon the "woman central protagonist is shown to be unable to achieve a stable sexual identity, torn between the deep blue sea of passive femininity and the devil of regressive masculinity" (30). The characters in these movies begin to show us a move toward a female subjectivity, and this subjectivity--as the conclusions of both movies suggest--reveals itself in unique and at times unpredictable ways.

Translating *The Odyssey*: A Comparative Computer Text Analysis

Staci Hull
Dakota State University

Throughout the centuries since Homer's *Odyssey* was first translated, it has been a source of constant study and continual fascination for both the scholar and the average reader. *The Odyssey* has been translated and re-translated over and over again, and references to the characters and events in *The Odyssey* appear in various places and times. For instance, in 1922, James Joyce published his novel *Ulysses*, and Robert Fagles and Richmond Lattimore produced popular translations later in the century. Each century appears to deem the epic poem worthy of yet another translation, and a myriad of scholars and writers have risen to the formidable challenge of translating *The Odyssey*. Nonetheless, this paper will narrow the focus to only three translations of *The Odyssey*, while seeking to establish comparisons and disparities in the three different translations of the classic tale.

The three translations of *The Odyssey* that I have chosen to analyze using Words, the computer text analysis program developed by Eric Johnson, are from different time periods and vastly differing translators.[1] Alexander Pope wrote his version of *The Odyssey* in 1725 while Samuel Butler published his translation in 1900. Samuel Henry Butcher and Andrew Lang reserved the year 1879 for their presentation of their unique version of *The Odyssey*. All three of these translators titled their versions similarly, as *The Odyssey* of Homer, and Samuel Henry Butcher is the only one who did not translate *The Iliad* as well. The number of words per translation fluctuates greatly from Pope's 111,492 to Butler's 127,279 to the most verbose of the three by far, Butcher/Lang's 138,483 (See Table 1).

In his preface to *The Odyssey*, Samuel Butler indicates that "the initial liberty of

[1] I used the electronic versions of each text available from Project Gutenberg: S. H. Butcher and Andrew Lang, *The Odyssey of Homer* (Project Gutenberg, Etext #1728, April 1999), retrieved January 15th, 2004 from <http://www.gutenberg.net/etext99/dyssy08a.txt>; Samuel Butler, *The Odyssey of Homer* (Project Gutenberg, Etext #1727, Feb. 2003), retrieved January 12th, 2004 from <http://www.gutenberg.net/etext99/dyssy10.txt>; and Alexander Pope, *The Odyssey of Homer* (Project Gutenberg, Etext #3160, April 2002), retrieved January 15th, 2004 from <http://www.gutenberg.net/etext02/dyssy10b.txt>.

translating poetry into prose involves the continual taking of more or less liberty throughout the translation; for much that is right in poetry is wrong in prose." Provided that the original text was in the form of poetic verse and Butler has translated *The Odyssey* into English prose, he has been forced to adjust the translation from its original form of poetic verse. Later in the preface, Butler states that one of the guiding principles a translator must follow while he or she endeavors to translate a work is to attempt to remain true to the language of the original text while considering the styles and forms of speech in the translator's time. Thus, we can assume that although Butler is endeavoring to preserve the purity of his translation, certain impurities are introduced into the translation because of the unavoidable and inevitable adjustments from converting poetry into prose.

According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "Pope offered his readers *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* as he felt sure Homer would have written them had he lived in early 18th-century England."[2] Pope's translation seems to host a variety of differences when compared to the other two translations, and this divergence is due not only to his restrictive and rigorous use of the heroic couplet but also to Pope's own unique choice of words and syntax. The practice of writing in heroic couplets was common in epic poetry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Butler along with Butcher/Lang write their separate versions in prose which, of course, differs considerably from the inevitable compromises and poetic creativity needed when attempting Pope's literary feat. Not only did Pope translate the entire *Odyssey*, but he also managed to do it with rhyming couplets.

When we compare the beginning of Book I of the three translations, striking differences are apparent. One of Butler's first sentences relates, "Tell me, O Muse, of that ingenious hero who travelled far and wide after he had sacked the famous town of Troy." This sentence is easy for us to read and understand as it is written in prose and is composed of language more modern in usage than the other two translations. Butcher/Lang write a similar sentence when they declare, "Tell me, Muse, of that man, so ready at need, who wandered far and wide, after he had sacked the sacred citadel of Troy." However, Pope begins his translation with "The man for wisdom's various arts renown'd / long exercised in woes, O Muse! resound; / who when his arms had wrought the destined fall / of sacred Troy." Even the beginning sentences bear a startling asymmetry, and none is more apparent than when we compare Pope's opening lines to those of Butler and Butcher/Lang. Not only is the choice of words different, but also the structure of the sentences are highly individualized. Butler utilizes clear, easily understood syntax, and although Butcher/Lang's statements are also clear and understandable, they favor inserting several commas into their text. Pope is distinct in both his phrasing and his word rhythm, and this propensity results from the century in which he lived and his own

[2] "Alexander Pope," Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2004. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. 12 Feb. 2004. á<http://search.eb.com/eb/article?eu=62387>.

personal decisions regarding the translation.

The number of unique word forms in the texts seems to share an inverse relationship with the total number of words. For instance, Pope uses the greatest number of unique words while he has the lowest amount of total words, and Butcher/Lang use the least number of unique words but have the greatest number of total words. This trend is also reflected with Butler's translation. My finding leads me to hypothesize that Pope may have attempted to be more original in his translation, and it could also be a result of Pope using poetic couplets; it is likely to assume that he needed a little more creative leeway to follow his strict rhyme pattern. Pope's translation seems to diverge from the other two translations as he tends to differ even in the number of words which one would reasonably assume to be common in all of the translations. For example, Butler along with Butcher/Lang use the word *water* which we might assume could be common since the setting is mainly on the sea. However, when we compare Pope's fifteen total uses of *water* to the other two's over one hundred uses, it is obvious that Pope's text has palpable differences in his choice of words. Another example of words that could be common in all of the translations is *suitor* and *suitors*. In Pope's text, *suitor* is used thirty-five times, but in the other two translations *suitor* is never used. Furthermore, *suitors* is written a total of 250 times in Butler's *Odyssey*, but only four times in Butcher/Lang's version. Thus, all three translations are disparate even in their choice of words which are seemingly common to the themes in the text; however, Pope appears to be unique in his choice of words which deviates from the others.

One of the noticeable differences between the texts is that Pope and Butler use Roman or Latin names for the Greek mythological figures while Butcher/Lang refer to the gods and goddesses by the Greek equivalent. For example, the Greek *Athene* is used 161 times by Butcher/Lang; yet, in Pope's translation, Pope uses *Athena* once, *Athene* never, and *Minerva* thirty-eight times. Butler also employs *Minerva* rather than *Athene* or *Athena* as his version solely features *Minerva* (151 times). *Vulcan* is the Roman name of the Greek *Hephaestus*, which is also spelled *Hephaistos*, and Pope prefers the Roman *Vulcan* (ten times). Butler also has a preference for *Vulcan* as he writes it eighteen times, whereas Butcher/Lang are predisposed to use *Hephaestus* (thirty times). In addition, Pope never calls Odysseus by the Greek name; rather, he utilizes *Ulysses*. Butler shares this inclination as he never writes *Odysseus* either. Despite the trend in the other translations, as with their preference for *Athene* or *Athena* over *Minerva*, Butcher/Lang identify the deities more often than not by the Greek names; specifically, the translators use *Odysseus* 653 times and *Ulysses* only in thirteen cases. Consequently, it appears as though Pope and Butler use the Roman form of the Greek names while Butcher/Lang remain more closely tied to the Greek origins but do not wholly eliminate the Roman forms from the work. One could construe that since Pope was a poet during the English Augustan period, he would utilize the Roman names of characters, but one cannot make the same assertion in Butler's case or provide a similar explanation as to the reason or reasons

Butcher/Lang prefer the Greek monikers to the Roman ones.

It is also interesting to note that although Butcher/Lang do not limit themselves exclusively to the Greek names they rarely deviate to the Roman names. The two write *Odysseus* for a much greater percentage of the time but also lay claim to *Ulysses* as a moniker. However, *Ulysses* is not introduced as an alternate for *Odysseus* until Book VIII in their translation, and even then *Odysseus* is much preferred and used more frequently. It could be construed that *Ulysses* is utilized for stage direction as it is frequently employed to describe an action of *Odysseus* rather than in dialogue. For instance, at the beginning of Book XXIII, it is merely a description of the setting: "The meeting of Ulysses and Penelope." In several other instances, *Ulysses* is used in much the same manner, to denote the setting of a scene. In Book X, Butcher/Lang write, "Circe: Ulysses at the table of Circe." Clearly, Butcher/Lang are employing *Ulysses* in order to distinguish between stage directions and actual text. Thus, in the dialogue between characters, *Odysseus* is used with far more frequency than *Ulysses* in Butcher/Lang's translation.

All three translations do share one common trait; the words *man*, *men*, and *mankind* are used far more often than *woman*, *women*, and *womankind*. This finding is not surprising as the tale is mainly about the journey of a man with his all male crew. The same relationship is shared by the words denoting the gods and goddesses such as *god* or *gods* and *goddess* or *goddesses* although in this case, the explanation is not a simple matter of *The Odyssey* merely referring to gods more often than goddesses. To be more specific, on average the translations use the masculine gender form of *man* seven times as much as they use the feminine *woman*. However, the words representing god and goddess are closer in amount of use with *god* winning the popularity contest in terms of amount of use. Nonetheless, the plural forms are remarkably disparate in number in Butler and Lang's translations. In Butler's *Odyssey*, the ratio is 178 to four for *gods* and *goddesses* respectively, and Butcher/Lang's translation has 295 mentions of *gods* with a mere eight mentions of *goddesses*.

The fact that *god* and *goddess* share a closer relationship than that of *man* and *woman* is also not an unfathomable mystery. While most of the action centers on and around male figures, these same men often summon both gods and goddesses to aid in their tasks or to overcome their obstacles. Therefore, the number of times *god* is used versus *goddess* is predictably closer in ratio although the word *god* is invoked with greater regularity.

	Pope's *Odyssey*	Butler's *Odyssey*	Butcher/Lang's *Odyssey*
Total Words	111,492	127,279	138,483
Unique word forms	9,042	7,327	6,540
arms	135	26	39
god/gods	140/2	97/178	173/295
goddess/goddesses	103/1	52/4	120/8
heaven	193	167	45
man/men	184/71	313/324	419/522
mankind	21	16	6
power/powers	121/66	7/0	6/0
suitor/suitors	35/77	0/250	0/4
woman/women	18/3	73/74	51/85
womankind	6	1	4
Jupiter/Zeus	2/0	0/0	0/274
Minerva/Athena/Athene	38/1/0	151/0/0	0/1/161
Juno/Hera	1/0	6/0	0/1
Ulysses/Odysseus	386/0	645/0	13/653
Venus/Aphrodite	6/0	15/0	0/15
Vulcan/Hephaistos/ Hephaestus	10/0	18/0	0/30

The choice of words used by the translators seems to be a matter of preference as many words are not employed in all of the versions. For instance, the word *powers* is used recurrently in Pope's rendition (sixty-six times) while Butler and Butcher/Lang do not make use of it at all. *Power* is used 121 times by Pope, yet Butler along with Butcher/Lang only use this word a combined total of thirteen times. Another word which shares this trend is *arms*. As with *power* and *powers*, Pope writes *arms* a grand total of 135 times while the other two combined do not use it even one hundred times. However, Pope and Butler do have a tendency to write *heaven* as they both use it over a hundred times. On the other hand, Butcher/Lang

write it only forty-five times.

In short, even though the translators may have valiantly attempted to remain true to an accurate translation from Greek to English, their individual preferences and characteristics emerged. This disparity is made apparent by the total amount of words differing by as much as 20,000 between Pope's and Butcher/Lang's translations. At first, I predicted that many words such as *Odysseus*, *arms*, *men*, and *goddess* would be common in all of the versions since they are translations rather than original works of literature and the storyline revolves around war and men. Nonetheless, my theory did not bear scrutiny as there is a vast disparity between each translator's use of certain words. Therefore, Butler, Pope, and Butcher/Lang produced strikingly dissimilar translations of *The Odyssey* as can be observed from the differing number of specific words throughout the texts as well as the vastly disparate opening of Book I of each translation.